FROM THE CHAIR
H. Stephen Wright, Northern Illinois University

Here at Northern Illinois University, we're cutting serials subscriptions again, and I suspect that we're not alone. This has been the fifth serials reduction since I arrived here in the summer of 1985. The process has become numbingly familiar: scouring long lists of titles and prices, desperately seeking some forgotten big-ticket item that will, when canceled, achieve the elusive serials/monographs balance without being missed. Yet one element of this cut is new: for the first time, the existence of electronic journals (or e-journals) is supposed to be a factor in our decisions. The NIU library administration dutifully provided departments and subject bibliographers with lists of periodicals available through online services such as IAC's Expanded Academic Index and OCLC's Electronic Collections Online.

The reaction of the faculty of the NIU School of Music to this list of e-journals was surprising. They initially asked me if they could take care of the required cuts by canceling these electronic publications! Their rationale was that this was a redundancy that we could not afford, and the paper journals were vastly preferable to their electronic counterparts. After I explained to them that these e-journals were received as part of packages purchased through the Illinois library consortium and were not part of our budget configuration, I reflected on what a dramatic statement they had made on the utility of e-journals. I realized that by attempting to introduce these relatively new electronic products into the serials reduction process, we were placing an unreasonable burden on a grossly immature technology.

It is, in fact, misleading to refer to most of these online services as e-journals. That term implies an equivalence which does not exist. What we have, instead, are indexing services which can sometimes deliver electronic versions of articles retrieved via author, subject, or keyword searches. To the uninitiated user, the availability of specific articles seems as random and as variable as the toss of a coin; some citations have a symbol indicating that full-text can be retrieved, while other citations do not. Sometimes the electronic version of the article is merely ASCII text, stripped of illustrations or other graphic components; sometimes it is an Adobe Acrobat version, which will provide a reasonably accurate visual simulation of the article, provided that you have the Adobe Acrobat software installed already and know what it is and how to use it. With many services, it is difficult or impossible to assemble an entire virtual journal issue on the screen. The familiar act of taking the latest issue of a favorite journal to a comfortable chair becomes a receding pre-technological memory.

Probably the most annoying aspect of using e-journal services is that there are too many of them, and more than one is too many. To find the latest articles from a particular journal, you must first know which electronic vendor offers that journal. Imagine a library in which it isn't enough to know the title or author of a book in order to find it in the catalog you have to know the publisher's name, too! This is a ludicrous scenario, yet it's exactly what we're doing to our clientele when we boast of our so-called e-journal collections.

The e-journal problem is strongly reminiscent of the early days of online catalogs. During the 1980s, as creaky, primitive online systems began to appear in libraries, library administrators insisted that card catalogs were no longer needed and pressured librarians to cease maintaining them, or even eliminate them entirely. Few people doubted that online catalogs would eventually displace manual catalogs, but the rush to consign cards to landfills was premature; at the time,
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most online systems were embarrassingly inferior to card catalogs. Then, as now, an immature technology was forced onto the stage unheated and unprepared.

That situation changed, and undoubtedly the e-journal situation will improve as well. Eventually we will see web-accessible versions of journals that are at least equivalent, if not superior, to the paper versions. That time, though, has not yet come. We must be cautious when our administrators speak of e-journals and paper journals as if they were functionally equivalent, or suggest that one obviates the other. Our clientele is perceptive enough to be in when something is not what we say it is, and we should be honest enough to present a nascent technology as it truly is, not as we hope it will be someday.

FROM THE OUT-GOING CONTINUING EDUCATION COORDINATOR, Neil Hughes

The time has come for me to pass the torch into the capable hands of my successor, Cheryl Taranto, and to bid farewell to the MOUG Board. There are many people whom I'll be thanking formally even as you read this, for their guidance and support during the two meetings I prepared in '97 and '98, but I want especially to thank Past Chair Karen Little, who was a master at remaining calm and focused while the Continuing Education Coordinator climbed the curtains in panic—I couldn't have done it without you, Karen! Thanks too to all the other folks who were on the Board during my tenure and who cheered me on and offered both moral and substantive support at all times: Ralph Papakhian, Steve Wright, Chris Grandy, Jane Penner, Lynn Gullickson, and of course, Jay Weitz. It was an honor to serve in such company, and I thank the membership for entrusting me with the responsibilities of my office. (To those of you who might be considering running for office in MOUG and who would like to know if I would willingly do it all again, my answer is a definite "Yes!")

My last thank-you goes to the two Program Committees who served with me to pull together your New Orleans and Boston meetings. You were a great bunch to work with, and, well... ditto what I said to Karen Little, above! I look forward to the next twenty years of MOUG.

Report on the Fall 1997 OCLC Users Council Meeting

H. Stephen Wright, Northern Illinois University

The OCLC Users Council held its fall 1997 meeting on October 5-7, at OCLC's headquarters in Dublin, Ohio. The theme of this meeting was "Integrate: Valuing Collaboration and Cooperation." The key questions to be addressed in the meeting were: (1) What are emerging trends and opportunities to facilitate new levels of integration? (2) What are the barriers to integration? (3) How can libraries and OCLC work together to ensure integration and system interoperability?

The meeting began Sunday night (October 5) with an address from Dr. K. Wayne Smith, President of OCLC. Dr. Smith made special mention of FirstSearch, which has gone "from no place to first place" in five years, and the forthcoming integration of Electronic Collections Online into FirstSearch. He identified some of the critical problems facing OCLC, such as the appearance of alternatives to OCLC services in cataloging and full-text databases, and the difficulty of recruiting and retraining technical personnel. He also announced that he would be stepping down as President in June of 1998.

The Monday morning session began with a panel discussion of "Challenges and Opportunities in Integrating Local Systems and OCLC," moderated by Betsy Wilson. Jerry Kliss, president of Innovative Interfaces, Inc., discussed the problems of workstation maintenance. He explained the distinction between "fat" and "thin" clients in the client/server model, and discussed the potential of the network computer for OPAC and circulation applications. Bernie Hurley, chief scientist for the University of California-Berkeley Library, discussed the "culture of sharing" in the library world, and how the evolution of the digital library is hampered by the lack of a foundation for sharing and integration in the digital world, as libraries are creating "islands" of proprietary information. He called for the creation of a national digital library as a way of continuing the culture of sharing into the digital age. Georgia Brown, OCLC's Vice-President for Product Development, addressed the relationship between OCLC services and local systems. She stressed the significant role of standards, such as Z39.50, in the integration of library systems with OCLC.

Following the panel discussion, the delegates broke into small interest groups: Technical Services and Resource Sharing, Communications and Access, and Reference Services/Electronic Publishing. The Technical Services group (which I attended) focused on the future of union lists. Union lists are in decline in some areas and are often perceived as a low priority, yet continuing serials cuts have elevated their importance. The delegates felt that union lists must be tied to indexing and document delivery systems and must adhere to national standards.

The afternoon session opened with "Telecommunications: The Ties That Bind." Larry Learm, Director of Telecommunications Planning for OCLC, discussed "What's Up in the Telecommunications Industry." He identified some of the major developments in telecommunications law since 1996, such as the overturning of the Communications Decency Act.
and the "nightmare of litigation" resulting from the Telecommunications Act of 1996. He advised libraries to pay more attention to the Universal Service Fund and the Clinton administration's efforts to restrict data encryption. Stuart Lynn, Associate Vice-President for Information Resources and Communications at the University of California, explained Internet 2, a new, more sophisticated data network being developed by approximately 100 universities. Internet 2 will offer greater capacity and reliability, more predictable Internet performance, and improved security. It will interconnect with the regular Internet, and will begin with the establishment of 20 "gigapops" or hubs at various universities.

Donald Muccino, OCLC's Executive Vice-President and Chief Operating Officer, gave a presentation on "Integrating OCLC's Products and Services." He explained how OCLC is seeking to achieve "vertical product integration" through the integration of all reference products into a single service, "horizontal product integration" through better links between reference, resource sharing, and cataloging services, and "systems integration" through the utilization of standards in OCLC products and the promotion of standards in the library community.

After another small group discussion period, Leo Voogt, Secretary General of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, discussed "The Value of International Collaboration and Cooperation." He offered three Chinese perspectives on the value of cooperation: "No one wave is totally alone in the seas of the world," "A tree alone cannot form a forest," and "The person who plants the tree is not the one who will enjoy the shadow." He explained the role of IFLA in international library cooperation, the challenges of cultural diversity and the struggles of libraries in underdeveloped countries.

Terry Noreault, Director of OCLC's Office of Research and Special Projects, offered a glimpse into "What's Happening in the Information Research Environment." He described many fascinating new OCLC projects, such as Kilroy, OCLC's effort to build a database of Internet resources, and Scorpion, which will automatically classify web resources by subject.

The Tuesday morning session began with an OCLC financial overview, provided by Rick Schwiererman, OCLC's Vice-President for Finance and Human Resources. He stated that OCLC's budget for 1998 is 140 million dollars; their major growth has been in reference services, while the role of cataloging has diminished. WorldCat is still OCLC's major revenue source, although non-WorldCat revenue continues to grow. OCLC, like everyone else, has had problems with rapid obsolescence of computers; a Tandem mainframe with an expected seven-year lifespan had to be replaced after only five years.

Liz Bischoff, OCLC's Vice-President for Member Services, followed with a general OCLC update and question-and-answer session. She mentioned some recent milestones, such as the 37 millionth WorldCat record and the 77 millionth interlibrary loan request. She also announced some recent enhancements to FirstSearch, including new databases and the integration of Electronic Collections Online, union lists, and interlibrary loan. ECO will eventually include more than 800 journals from 21 publishers. She also mentioned some of OCLC's new products, such as the Windows version of the Cataloging Microenhancer and the OCLC Software Suite on CD-ROM.

The delegates then divided into small interest groups for further discussion: Communications and Access, Reference Services/Electronic Publishing, Resource Sharing, and Technical Services. In the Communications and Access interest group (which I attended), OCLC's Shirley Hyatt led the discussion. She emphasized OCLC's efforts to migrate all users to the Windows environment; there are still thousands of non-Windows OCLC workstations in use, though OCLC is ending support for DOS software. The group then discussed strategies for encouraging users to move from multidrop connections to TCP/IP.

After the delegates reassembled, each interest group presented a report on the major points they wished to communicate to OCLC. The Reference Services/Electronic Publishing group asked for cross-database search capabilities in FirstSearch, cataloging copy for periodicals available through full-text databases, and an integrated user interface. The Resource Sharing group requested direct (end-user) ILL capabilities, more flexible FirstSearch contracts, and integrated systems for document delivery. The Technical Services group emphasized the lack of standards across different systems and vendors, and urged OCLC to assume a leadership role in promoting standards. A short business meeting concluded the meeting.

**NEWS FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS**

**Deta S. Davis, Library of Congress**

The past year has been brimming with many accomplishments and new initiatives. Two big successes have been the full scale implementation of our Music Cataloger Sabbatical Program and the creation and distribution of the Machine-Derived Authority Records which are part of the LC/OCLC Uniform Titles Correction Project. These will be covered later in this report. Staffing for music cataloging improved in the Special Materials Cataloging Division. The music teams were particularly fortunate to have hired two very qualified additional catalogers via our career enhancement program whose goal was to promote technicians from within the Library. In July, Paul Frank joined the Music and Sound Recordings Team I, and Jungja Yoon joined Music and Sound Recordings Team II. They both have strong music backgrounds and between them
they know seven different foreign languages, including Chinese, Korean, Hungarian, and Russian. We were also very pleased to have Lucas Graves return to music cataloging from the Rare Book Team. Three technicians left the music teams. There are now currently 18 catalogers and 11 technicians on the three Music and Sound Recordings Teams.

In fiscal year 1997 (October 1996-September 1997), Music and Sound Recordings Teams I and II cleared a total of 12,371 items. This number includes 3,338 scores (808 full original, 1,389 copy, and 808 production level cataloging, in addition to other categories), 4,097 sound recordings (including 1,950 full original, 1,416 production level cataloging, and other categories), and 4,160 books and serials. From the beginning of October to the end of December 1997, the teams cleared a total of 3,261 items, which includes 1,075 sound recordings, 1,421 scores, and 605 books and serials.

**SOUND RECORDING ARREARAGE**

**Armed Forces Radio and Television Service Project**

The Library of Congress’ holdings of the Armed Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS) Collection are issues of radio programs broadcast to troops abroad. The programs were first broadcast worldwide in 1942 and continued to this day. The broadcasts comprise a variety of entertainment, from music to dramatic scripts. Cumulative totals for inventory level cataloging of the collection utilizing an Alpha 4 relational database application are 54,248 discs processed, an increase of an additional 9,592 records created since last year. Out of an original total of 125,000 records to catalog, about 71,000 remain to be cataloged. Last year we announced that these records, along with the 78 rpm records created under the Altshuler Project, would be accessible through the LC Web Page. We still plan for that to happen, but not until 1998.

Staffing shortages and delayed hiring processes unexpectedly prolonged our plans.

**A-Z Inventory Projects**

Work has progressed on the A-Z Cassettes Project. Technicians from the Special Materials Cataloging Division and the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division (M/B/RS) are processing the Copyright Cassettes Collection. This collection comprises the vast majority of the Library’s entire cassette collection which has approximately 67,000 items. These cassettes, acquired through copyright, are being cataloged utilizing Cuadra STAR software. The process employs a resource file of the copyright cataloging records for the cassettes. The technicians utilize this data and enhance the record by adding information for song titles and tape publishers. In September 1997, a contract was awarded to Aspen to catalog the remaining 11,000 cassettes. As of the end of December 1997, 34,781 records had been enhanced.

**Sondheim collection**

Processing of the Stephen Sondheim collection of LPs continues. The collection was originally expected to include 15,000 items, but we did not receive the popular music from the collection. When all we received was sorted and counted, we had received an actual total of 8,577 LPs. Technicians in MSR III found copy in LC files (MUMS and PreMARC) and on OCLC for 6,701 items. 1,876 items were forwarded for full cataloging. Copy on OCLC was found for many more by the catalogers and cataloging has been progressing well. Only about 350 items are still waiting full cataloging. We expect them to be completed in 1998.

**LC Concert Tapes**

Chamber music concerts have been presented by the Music Division of the Library of Congress since the Coolidge Auditorium was built in 1925. Since the late 1930’s, most of the concerts have been recorded and many were broadcast on radio both locally and nationally. Because of the great artistic and research value of the over 1,500 Coolidge concerts recorded, the preserved tape collection is nearly totally cataloged with full-level records. Of the concerts which have been preserved on studio-grade magnetic tape only 167 remain to be cataloged. The concert tapes document a great musical heritage by an extensive roster of internationally famous performers. Some prominent examples are Artur Rubenstein, Robert Casadesus, Isaac Stern, Nathan Milstein, Janos Starker, Gregor Piatigorsky, Leonard Rose, Leontyne Price, Jan DeGaetani, Peter Pears, Leopold Stokowski, and Sir Thomas Beecham. The variety of chamber music repertory performed is vast and includes 20th-century compositions, many having been commissioned by foundations in the Library of Congress. Significant repertory given world premieres include Aaron Copland’s Appalachian Spring ballet, Stravinsky’s Elegia for solo viola, and Darus Milhaud’s String Quartet No. 10. Some concerts even presented composers and compositions not otherwise represented on commercial recordings, in the Library of Congress’ catalogs, or in major library utilities such as OCLC or RLIN. In combination with the Library of Congress’ vast archives of musical scores, manuscripts, and recordings from all over the world, as well as the specialized expertise of its staff, the tradition of concerts in the Coolidge Auditorium is a very valuable treasure of the Library. These concerts document live recordings for posterity and contribute to the appreciation and perpetuation of a great musical heritage.

**Secrict Collection**

The Secrict Collection is made up of approximately 1,500 classical 78 rpm recordings of vocal music. Work began on this collection as a project for our visiting sabbatical librarians, and we have continued work on the collection. The collection includes many rare operatic items, in addition to a large
selection of pieces sung by Rosa Ponselle and tenor Enrico Caruso. Many of the other performers are little-known today and the titles provided on the discs were often in mangled English. Even though these were cataloged as PLC many authority records were created to link these titles to legitimate, but somewhat lesser-known arias and songs.

45s Project

The arrangement of 45 rpm sound recordings consists of about 125,000 discs, primarily popular music from the 1950s, '60s, '70s, and '80s. Catalogers and technicians on detail to a SWAT team from their regular assignments input records on Bibliographic Workstations (BWSs) using VX-REXX software. The Mega Guide to Singles has been licensed and loaded into these machines as a resource database. In addition, Dick Thaxter, Automation Operations Coordinator, Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division (M/B/RS), has devised a way to incorporate copyright cataloging data into the 45s database. Cataloging records are loaded into M/B/RS's Cuadra STAR "SONIC" database and will be searchable by the public over the World Wide Web later this year. Over 3,000 records have been created since work began on the project the last week of October 1997.

Upcoming projects for '98

Concert Series: We have about 500 recordings of the concert series America in Concert which we will begin cataloging this spring. These recordings will receive full-level cataloging. When that is completed, we will begin the 3,000-tape collection of Music from Marlboro. Other concert series will be done in the future as we can coordinate these programs with cataloging current receipts.

LC/OCLC RESEARCH CONTRACT

As a result of the joint research project between the Library of Congress and OCLC, LC has loaded 67,000 machine-derived name authority records into the National Authority File. The LC/OCLC Uniform Title Corrections Project is developing software to correct and update title headings in bibliographic records, which will help advance large-scale authority control.

The project is creating authority records for music because, according to established guidelines, the music catalogers do not create authority records for all uniform titles used in bibliographic records. Authority records for uniform titles were created only when references were needed or when the results of research needed to be recorded. Therefore, the bibliographic file in conjunction with the authority file serve as the authoritative source for uniform titles. As a result of the research project, several thousand bibliographic records which have not been and will not be examined by Library of Congress catalogers will be added to the MUMS Music File. In order for the music catalogers to continue to have workable access to authoritative headings, the headings currently in the MUMS Music File not covered by authority records have had machine-derived authority records created for them. The process is as follows:

OCLC has compared headings in LC's Music File (personal names, corporate names, and name/uniform titles) against the Name Authority File. If a heading does not already exist in an authority record, a new one will be created. The machine-derived authority records will include a 1XX field, a 670, and a 667 with the legend "Machine-derived authority record." The 670 will contain a shortened form of the 1XX main entry (if there is one), a title citation which will include a citation from the 245 subfield a, date, and, if the heading appears in the subfield c of the 245, a usage citation. The 1XX main entry is included within the 670, because we determined that with the high number of music records which contain a non-distinctive 245 title, the additional information could be essential in many instances to identify the source record. The date is taken from the subfield c of the 260 field of the source bibliographic record. In some instances, cross references may be generated if certain interpretive situations occur, such as a compound surname. The encoding level of these records in the 008/33 will be "d" for "Preliminary."

These records may be used, modified, and upgraded according to normal LC/NACO authority procedures. However, if appropriate, the "Preliminary" encoding in the 008/33 should be replaced. If encoding becomes available for machine-derived authority records, the legend "Machine-derived authority record" will be retroactively removed from the 667 and replaced by an appropriate code in the fixed fields.

Further development and completion of the uniform title correction algorithms will continue in 1998 and are expected to be completed very soon. Once the algorithms are functional, LC will have the sound recording bibliographic records it has purchased processed and will add the records to its Music File.

MOTION PICTURE, BROADCASTING, AND RECORDED SOUND DIVISION

1997 was the first full year for the reorganized Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division (M/B/RS), in which sections are now organized by format rather than function. Under the new division organization, reference, curatorial, and processing functions for moving image (film and video formats) and sound (recordings and radio) are united under individual respective sections. Samuel Brylawski is the head of the Recorded Sound Section, comprised of over twenty staff members, including three reference librarians in the Recorded Sound Reference Center, and seven full-time catalogers. The careful coordination of preservation, reader access, and processing policies is now centrally balanced and
implemented. For the first time in the history of the Library, there is a manager devoted exclusively to bibliographic control of sound recordings, Eugene DeAnna, head of the Processing Unit of the Recorded Sound Section. Mary Russell Bucknum has most recently joined the section as Curator of Sound Recordings. The newly-created section is expected to greatly increase acquisitions of sound recordings and develop new policies and programs for their preservation.

In the planning stage is a move of many collections to an off-site storage and preservation facility in Culpeper, Virginia. Negotiations leading toward the acquisition of that facility by a private foundation on behalf of the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division and the Library are expected to be complete early this spring.

The M/B/RS Cuadra STAR Database

M/B/RS and the Special Materials Cataloging Division have been working steadily to reach the goal set by the Librarian of Congress to bring all of the Library's sound recordings under bibliographic control by the year 2005. This year both divisions have enjoyed increases in staff to meet this target, but short of a cataloging staff in the hundreds, we would not be able to create standard AACR2, MARC records with authorities for every one of the 3 million recordings in the collections of the Library of Congress.

Thus, M/B/RS has created an in-house Cuadra STAR database for item-level descriptions of unpublished recordings and catalog records for recordings which are not bibliographically controlled in the Library's MUMS database. Having full control of the database has offered M/B/RS a number of opportunities: They are able to utilize resource records obtained from outside sources, as data sources for cataloging and as loadable records for donations which are inventoried on external databases. By designing their own database structure they can handle unusual intellectual works, such as serial-like radio programs, and are able to describe multiple-versions of a work, such as original instantaneous recordnings, preservation tapes, reference access tapes. The Cuadra STAR database has also enabled M/B/RS to implement linking fields. One particular cataloging project, that of the Franz Liszt Society collection, forced them to tackle complex and interesting classical music cataloging issues. The collection was chosen for cataloging to see how STAR deals with such issues. For the Liszt project, popular and uniform titles of classical works, which are recorded in different fields, are tied together with a linking indicator. This may be the first time that links are used in a catalog record created by the Library of Congress.

Sometime in 1998 the M/B/RS Cuadra STAR database will be searchable by the public through the World Wide Web. A link to the database will be created from the M/B/RS Recorded Sound Reference Center home page.

The American Vintage Record Labelography

Several years ago, the Library completed an inventory of half of its 78 rpm disc collection by enlisting staff throughout the Library to devote half-days to disc sorting and inventory efforts, known as the Altschuler Project. The data resulting from the 78 rpm disc project has now been loaded into the M/B/RS Cuadra STAR system and data cleanup is underway. The Library acquired "resource data" for that project from the contributors to the planned American Vintage Record Labelography, or AVRL. The AVRL will be a multi-label CD-ROM discography project, the goal of which is to include every 78 rpm recording sold in the United States. The AVRL is planned as an evolving, dynamic discography which will double as a research tool and a means for private collectors to catalog their own holdings. It is the brainchild of record dealer Kurt Nauck, who has recruited dozens of volunteer data contributors to the project, an editor, and a programmer who will assist in data cleanup, record de-duplication, and the writing of the application to use the data. In return for the resource data the Library obtained from the project, the Library has contributed over 80,000 inventory records to the American Vintage Record Labelography. The AVRL is now officially associated with the Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC). Sam Brylawski is chair of the Labelography Associates Committee of ARSC, the liaison between ARSC and the discography project.

The discography's programmer, Edward Hopkins, is now converting the ARSC Rigler/Deutsch index database files into the AVRL file structure for use in the AVRL. There, the Rigler/Deutsch records will be compared to existing AVRL records, cleaned up, and loaded into M/B/RS's Cuadra STAR database. Hopkins, developer of a record-cataloging PC program, Sound Librarian, has extensive experience in conversion of PC-authored bibliographic records to the MARC format. Another Rigler/Deutsch participant is planning on adding necessary authorities to their Rigler/Deutsch records and converting them to MARC, possibly for OCLC load.

Another expected result of the American Vintage Record Labelography will be an internal, working, "authority file" of label names and manufacturers, to aid standard description of 78 rpm recordings and ease use of the AVRL database. The Library sees all aspects of the American Vintage Record Labelography as very positive developments in which a new means of sharing discographic and cataloging data is created, private collector knowledge and cataloging is made available to institutions (and vice versa), and the pioneering work of ARSC's early 1980's Rigler/Deutsch Index is continued.
REPORT FROM THE CATALOGING POLICY AND SUPPORT OFFICE, 1997

Class M Review

A review of the draft of the online version of LCC Class M was at the top of the 1997 agenda, conducted under the auspices of the Music Cataloging Advisory Group. Activity on reviewing the schedule was delayed until spring because of difficulties in the production of a review copy. The group completed the review by the end of the year. A more detailed report on this project will be presented to the Subject Access Subcommittee of MLA's Bibliographic Control Committee at the Boston conference.

Music Cataloging Advisory Group (MCAG)

The MCAG's responsibilities are to identify projects and issues that need attention within the scope of music cataloging, to stay aware and be proactive in the development of cataloging policies and guidelines, and to prepare reports and recommendations as needed. The group addresses the interests of all music users at the Library of Congress. Its 10 members are from the Music Division, the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division, the Special Materials Cataloging Division's music teams, and the Cataloging Policy and Support Office, whose music specialist serves as chair.

In addition to conducting the review of the draft of the revised M schedule, the group addressed the following issues:

- Music in the Enhanced CD Format. Acquisition, custody, cataloging, and service of this format all require new policies and procedures. Together, Music and Sound Recordings Teams I and II and the Computer Files Team are completing a final working version of a cataloging policy for enhanced music CDs. These guidelines will be reviewed by CPSO, particularly in view of the recently issued "Draft Interim Guidelines for Cataloging Electronic Resources" (posted on CPSO's home page, http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpsombo/demb19_4.html).

- Music access points for moving image materials. As a result of discussions between music and film catalogers, M/B/RS issued a policy memo that provides for access points for musical works in designated types of moving image materials. LC catalogs moving image works using Archival Moving Image Materials (A.M.I.M.) as the descriptive standard, which requires main entry under title. Access points for names and music uniform titles are from, or created for, the name authority file in AACR2 form.

- Form/genre implementation. Participation in this initiative by music users, though on the MCAG agenda early in the year, was deferred as other major issues intervened: 1) Additional data elements for authority records, including records for subject subdivisions, have to be implemented first; 2) Indexing subfield $v$ in bibliographic records needs separate review by systems staff; 3) Intellectual aspects of form/genre implementation are being addressed using computer files as the model format.

Subject Heading Practice

Practice has changed in one area of subject heading application. Hyphens are no longer added to terms for musical instruments, ensembles, performers, etc., that consist of two words (e.g., English horn) when the term for the musical instrument is used as an adjective, e.g., English horn music. This change reduces searches on these terms to a single search on each search key in systems where indexes observe hyphens.

MUSIC DIVISION, ACQUISITIONS AND PROCESSING SECTION

Activities During FY97

Once again, the Music Division added significantly to its holdings of many types of American music. Over the past few years, the division has focused on jazz. This year the division acquired further materials from Louis Bellson, Ella Fitzgerald, Gerry Mulligan, and Billy Taylor. The division also acquired the Robert D. Darrell Collection which includes research materials, clippings, correspondence, photographs, and business records of the record critic and writer. In the area of popular American music, the widow of Billy Byers gave the Library approximately 4,000 holograph scores of her husband's arrangements of popular songs. Newly-established collections of other American arts figures include the Irwin Bazelon Collection and the Peggy Clark Collection. The Library also added significantly to the Irving Berlin Collection. The Library added new correspondence to the Gershwin Collection, and we received the second of three shipments of materials comprising the Ned Rorem Collection. The music collections also grew with the receipt of numerous other items relating to American music.

Apart from acquisition of American music, we enhanced our holdings of music from Europe and throughout the world. The Library added materials of Liszt, Haydn, Samuel Coleridge-Taylor, and Sir Michael Tippett to its collection. Fairleigh Dickinson University gave the Library a gift of the David J. Grunes Collection of rare Imperial Russian and Soviet sheet music, containing about 2,500 pieces of music, dating from the 1890s until 1945.

Processing activities produced detailed finding aids on the Lauro Ayestarà, Franziska Boas, Irving Fine, Mannes-Damrosch, Pola Nirensak, Arne Oldberg, Rugh Page, and Harold Spivacke Collections. Progress continued on the Tams-
music cataloger in cataloging was Dance Heritage Coalition trainees MIJSIC featured a re-enactment of music catalogers to come to the NACO Music Project projects. participants will clld In October, the Coolidge Witmark LC their help the the Congress. catabgasfortheMusic issoea soebmiaedby Barry Zaslow, Miami University, as the NACO-Music liaison. At the end of June, Joe August nameltitle &err/liaison achieved independence in the and two are already independent. Barry Zaslow, Miami University, and Margaret Kaus, University of Jacksonville. It was very successful for all the participants and the Library of Congress. Two of the participants who came as NACO-Music trainees (Mr. Zaslow and Ms. Kaus) left as independent contributors. The sabbatical is an opportunity for working music catalogers to come to the Library of Congress for three to six months and receive one-on-one training with a senior music cataloger in cataloging sound recordings. The participants will also participate in various arrearage reduction projects. If you would like more information, please contact Susan Vita (svit@loc.gov) or Deta Davis (ddav@loc.gov).

COOPERATIVE CATALOGING AND OTHER OUTREACH

NACO Music Project

From January through June, Richard Hunter continued to serve as the NACO-Music liaison. At the end of June, Joe Bartl became the primary liaison, while Richard continued reviewing only series authority records submitted by Mark Scharff at Washington University. The NACO-Music duties ranged from the simple bibliographic file maintenance required by heading creation or changes to clarifying or defining complex policy issued brought to the fore by various NACO-Music catalogers. LC would like to express its gratitude to these catalogers for their help in the dynamic and endless process of code review and revision—a service which benefits the entire music cataloging, reference, and research communities.

Phil De Sellem continued to serve as a NACO-Music Project reviewer/liaison for approximately ten libraries, many of which are already independent. During 1997, one of these libraries and two librarians visiting the Library on sabbatical at LC achieved independence in the submission of name and name/title authorities. Barry Zaslow, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio (OoxM-Ma) achieved independence in mid-August at LC. Both David Brown, Rodgers and Hammerstein Collection, New York Public (NN-RHF) and Margaret Kaus, University of North Florida, Jacksonville (FJUNFCM) achieved independence in mid-November (also at LC). During 1997, Phil has also reviewed music subject heading proposals submitted by SACO (Subject Authority Cooperative) libraries.

He has also served as the LC liaison to the NACO-AV funnel project administered by Ann Caldwell, Brown University.

CLOSING

ILS

The biggest change to face catalogers at the Library of Congress in more than a decade is the upcoming installation of a new integrated library system to replace the current MUMS, our historic in-house cataloging and searching system. The vendor has not yet been selected, but the process is on schedule. Barbara Tillett, on leave from her position as chief of the Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO), is the director of the Integrated Library System Program. Tom Yee will be acting chief of CPSO until Ms. Tillett returns. The new system must be installed and functional before October 1, 1999. In order to accomplish this heroic task, up to twenty-five percent of the Library's staff will probably be mobilized to address all the thousands of issues that will arise. This will also impact anyone searching the Library's collections from the outside. The Library expects many benefits from adding the ILS, including having all bibliographic functions, such as acquisitions, cataloging, and circulation all on one system and having an online shelflist.

NEWS FROM OCLC

Compiled by Jay Weitz

General News

OCLC Access Suite Available

In its ongoing effort to integrate products and services, OCLC has introduced the OCLC Access Suite—a single compact disc that contains all of the software member libraries need to access and use OCLC's cataloging and interlibrary loan services. The OCLC Access Suite, priced as an annual license, offers OCLC members the option of having the latest major versions of OCLC interface software products as they become available, eliminating the need to budget for each product as it is released. Users also have the option of continuing to acquire individual software licenses separately at current prices. The OCLC Access Suite includes micro software products designed for use with OCLC online services: OCLC Passport for Windows software, OCLC ILL Micro Enhancer for Windows software, OCLC Cataloging Micro Enhancer for Windows software, OCLC CJK software, and OCLC Cataloging Label Program. The annual license arrangement entitles libraries to updates and new versions. OCLC will send new versions to OCLC Access Suite users as part of the annual license arrangement. Users who purchase the OCLC Access Suite no longer need to decide whether to purchase an upgrade and then order it. Additionally, users will receive and may load new products added to the
OCLC Access Suite as they are released. Pricing information is available from OCLC-affiliated regional network offices, international offices and distributors, and the OCLC National Sales Office (1-614-764-6251 or 1-800-848-5878, ext. 6251).

OCLC Awards 1997 Research Grants

The OCLC Office of Research has awarded two Library and Information Science Research Grants to university researchers for 1997. Francis Miksa, professor, the University of Texas at Austin, received a grant for "Examining the Attributes of Information Resources on the World Wide Web and Testing for Their Usefulness as Metadata." Jian Qin, assistant professor, University of Southern Mississippi, received a grant for "Computational Representation of Web Objects in an Interdisciplinary Digital Library: a Survey and an Experiment in Polymer Science." The OCLC Library and Information Science Research Grant program awards grants of up to $10,000 to help foster quality research by faculty in schools of library and information science. Projects are generally completed within one year, and findings are published in the Annual Review of OCLC Research and in the public domain.

OCLC Issues 1996/97 Annual Report

OCLC has issued its 1996/97 Annual Report, its 30th. For the year ended June 30, 1997, OCLC’s revenues were $155.6 million, up 52 percent from the previous year. Contribution to equity was $7.4 million, up 2.1 percent from the previous year. OCLC’s overall financial performance once again enabled it to continue to add value to OCLC membership and to reduce information costs by providing another $1 million subsidy to member libraries to trade in their old workstations for state-of-the-art machines. OCLC also provided member libraries with $8.2 million in credits to encourage the growth and quality of WorldCat. Among the highlights of the 1996/97 Annual Report:

- The number of participating libraries increased from 22,645 to 25,108.
- More than 2,880 libraries in 62 countries outside the United States now participate in OCLC.
- Libraries cataloged 44.5 million items on OCLC.
- 2.1 million cataloging records were added to WorldCat.
- Location listings grew from 602 million to 638 million.
- 8.1 million interlibrary loans were arranged online.
- ILL Fee Management participants grew from 707 to 908.
- More than 10,000 libraries in 53 countries are now using the OCLC FirstSearch service, which is ranked first in terms of connect time among end-user reference systems in the information community.
- FirstSearch users performed nearly 36 million searches, up 44 percent over the previous year.
- OCLC added five databases to FirstSearch and expanded the Base Package.

- OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online was launched in June 1997 and now has nearly 900 journals from 21 publishers signed up.

Maureen Finn Named Director of Cataloging and Conversion Services Division

Maureen Finn, director of Conversion and Contract Cataloging Services since 1993, was named director of the new Cataloging and Conversion Services Division. In her new post, Ms. Finn is responsible for OCLC’s online cataloging, collection development, resource sharing, and authority control services (Collections and Technical Services Division), as well as OCLC’s in-house online and offline cataloging services (Conversion and Contract Cataloging Services Division). Ms. Finn joined OCLC in 1984 as a marketing representative for Conversion and Contract Cataloging Services. She was named department manager in 1991 and division director in 1993. Prior to joining OCLC, she worked at the National Security Agency in Ft. Meade, Maryland, as a manager and catalyst. She also worked in acquisitions at the University of Rochester Library in New York, and in the Special Research Library at the University of Kansas. Ms. Finn holds a bachelor’s degree in English from the University of Kansas and a master’s degree in library science from the University of Maryland.

Lynn Kellar Named Director of Database and Offline Products Division

Lynn Kellar, formerly manager of the Database and Offline Products Department, has been named director of the new Database and Offline Products Division, where she will be responsible for software that enhances WorldCat (the OCLC Online Union Catalog) through the matching and loading of records, WorldCat quality software, authority services, and other offline loading and processing. Ms. Kellar joined OCLC in 1986 and has held development positions in research, marketing, technical services, and reference services. She was project manager for development of the Online Journal of CURRENT CLINICAL TRIALS, the first peer-reviewed electronic journal, which was created with the American Association for the Advancement of Science. She also worked on the development of the OCLC Cataloging service, and EPIC, OCLC’s reference service for library professionals. Prior to joining OCLC she was technical planner and analyst with Rolls-Royce, in Atlanta, Georgia. She also worked as a systems analyst for a variety of companies, including AT&T, ITT, Toledo Scale, and AccuRay. Ms. Kellar holds a bachelor’s degree from Pennsylvania State University in biology and has done graduate studies in ecology at the Georgia Institute of Technology. She currently serves on the membership committee of the Library and Information Technology Association, a division of the American Library Association.
Mark Matson Appointed Director of Corporate Human Resources

Mark Matson has been appointed director of OCLC Corporate Human Resources. Mr. Matson joined OCLC in 1987 as an intern through the Ohio State University Graduate School of Business program. At the conclusion of his internship, he was hired as a recruiter and, in the ensuing years, has been promoted to positions of increasing responsibility, including manager, employee relations and development, and manager of human resources. He holds a master's degree in labor relations and human resources management from Ohio State University as well as a master's degree in theology from Boston College. He earned a bachelor's degree in urban studies from the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. Mr. Matson recently secured the highest professional designation, Senior Professional in Human Resources, from the National Society for Human Resource Management in Washington, D.C. Mr. Matson is a trustee and former president of Columbus Christmas in April, a United Way agency that rehabilitates the homes of the elderly and disabled. He serves as a volunteer community educator for the Columbus AIDS Task Force and is a former trustee of the Columbus Literacy Council and Leadership Columbus.

CATALOGING

Machine-Derived Authority Records

As part of the LC/OCLC Uniform Title Correction Project, OCLC generated approximately 66,000 machine-derived authority records derived from the Library of Congress Multiple Use MARC System (MUMS) Music File (sound recordings). The authority records contain the label "Machine-derived authority records" in the 667 field with Authority status coded "d" (preliminary) and OCoLC in the 040. OCLC began submitting the records to LC December 16, 1997. As these records were derived from LC MUMS bibliographic records, it is possible that duplicates will be created so please report these to LC as they are encountered, preferably to Deta Davis (ddav@loc.gov), as most of the headings are music-related. Some examples of records are: no97-72176, no97-72205, no97-72206, no97-72209. (From Susan Westberg, OCLC Collections and Technical Services Division)

OCLC Cataloging Micro Enhancer for Windows now Available

OCLC has released its new Cataloging Micro Enhancer for Windows, which allows users to combine batch online searching and processing with offline editing. OCLC CatME for Windows provides improved functionality and added features over the previous DOS-based CAT ME Plus, including more batch processing options, access to more databases, local area network capability, and an interactive connection to OCLC Cataloging to retrieve full records. Users upgrading from the DOS-based product to CatME for Windows will be able to combine online and offline cataloging with interactive and batch access within a single interface. The new product also integrates with the OCLC PromptCat service and the OCLC Bibliographic Record Notification service, allowing users to send one command to automatically download all of their records from these online files to their local file in CatME. CatME for Windows is available for purchase separately or as part of the new OCLC Access Suite. The OCLC Access Suite will offer OCLC members the latest major versions of OCLC software products as they become available, eliminating the need to budget for each product as it is released. The OCLC Access Suite, priced as an annual license, includes software products designed for use with OCLC online services: OCLC Passport for Windows software, OCLC ILL Micro Enhancer for Windows software, OCLC Cataloging Micro Enhancer for Windows software, OCLC CJK software, and OCLC Cataloging Label Program.

Cataloging Internet Resources, 2nd edition, by Nancy B. Olson

OCLC announces the availability of Cataloging Internet Resources, 2nd edition, by Nancy B. Olson. This manual was originally developed to aid those who participated in the OCLC/US Department of Education-funded project, "Building a Catalog of Internet Resources." It describes in detail the preparation of bibliographic description for electronic resources. Nancy Olson is well known in the cataloging community for her expertise in classifying electronic resources. Additional copies are available at no charge from OCLC; please send orders for MAN2119 to orders@oclo.org. The second edition is also available on the OCLC Web site at:
Report on the Harmonization of German and ACR2 Cataloging Rules Available

The final report of the REUSE project, which focused on harmonizing German and ACR2 cataloging rules, is now available on the OCLC Web site. In October 1995, OCLC, the Library of Congress (LC) and the State and University Library of Göttingen, seat of the Regional Library Network for Central and Northern Germany, agreed to join in Project REUSE with the goal of enhancing international bibliographic compatibility. The REUSE report includes information on project execution, the goals and assumptions agreed upon by the participants in September 1995, the participants and organizational structure of the project, a short account of the methodological approach adopted, the results achieved, possible relations with ongoing activities in the field, and a series of observations. The report is found at

http://www.oclc.org/oclc/cataloging/reuse_project/index.htm

Dewey for Windows, Version 1.1 Available

An updated Dewey for Windows is now available on compact disc from OCLC Forest Press. First released in 1996, Dewey for Windows provides an electronic version of the Dewey Decimal Classification (21st edition) in a convenient Windows-based environment. The new release of Dewey for Windows retains all of the functionality of the original version and enhances it with a routine to produce cutter numbers, an online guide, the option to purchase a subscription to the LC Subject Headings Authority File, and more. The online Dewey for Windows Guide, part of the improved help system in version 1.1, helps classifiers use Dewey for Windows effectively. Written by Julianne Beall, assistant editor of the DDC, the guide explains the contents, record types, and display options of the Dewey for Windows database. It also uses specific examples and more than 230 screen displays to illustrate searching and number building. With version 1.1, users also have the option of purchasing a subscription to the Library of Congress Subject Headings Authority File. The Authority File contains all subject headings and cross-references established by the Library of Congress, and is included on the Dewey for Windows compact disc. Users who purchase the subscription automatically receive a copy of the OCLC CatCD for Windows software, which is needed to access the Authority File. Subscribers also receive automatic quarterly updates to the Authority File. With the Authority File and Dewey for Windows on the same disc, users can cut and paste search terms between the two databases, using each to supplement and enhance the other. Other enhancements to Dewey for Windows include the integration of all corrections and changes made to the DDC since 1996 and the addition of new index terms representing the 900 most frequently used built numbers. In addition, new statistical mappings in the LC Subject Headings Index from WorldCat, plus selected LC Subject Headings/Dewey Decimal Classification mappings
from the Dewey Home Page, have been added as intellectually mapped subject headings.

Dublin Core and Web MetaData Standards Converge in Helsinki

The National Library of Finland and OCLC cosponsored the fifth metadata workshop Oct. 6-8 in Helsinki, Finland, with support from the National Science Foundation and the Coalition for Networked Information. Seventy-five experts from libraries, the networking research community, the digital library research community, and content providers continued work begun in 1995 to reach consensus on conventions for describing resources on the Internet. At the Helsinki meeting, representatives from the W3C Metadata Project presented the first draft of a new specification for extended Web metadata—the Resource Description Framework (RDF)—and demonstrated how it meets the infrastructure and encoding requirements identified at the series of international Dublin Core workshops. More information on the Dublin Core is available at http://purl.org/metadata/dublin_core, on the W3C Resource Description Framework at http://www.w3.org/metadata/rdf, and on the Resource Description Framework metadata activity at http://www.w3.org/metadata.

PromptCat Gains New Processing Options

The OCLC PromptCat service now features new processing options that enhance its efficiency and ease of use while further lowering costs associated with technical processing of library materials. The new options-spine labels, the addition of local data, and streamlined shipping by vendors-support vendor-provided shelf-ready materials in combination with PromptCat cataloging records. The new PromptCat functionality increases library productivity by providing records with location and copy information that can be loaded into a local system without additional staff intervention to create local-item records and overlay order records. Using call numbers from records supplied by PromptCat, OCLC creates an electronic file of labels. Libraries may choose type of call number, format, and whether the vendor or the library retrieves the file. Libraries can print the file in-house using the OCLC Cataloging Label Program or may have a vendor pick up the file for shelf-ready materials. OCLC can now also add location, and copy and volume numbers, to the bibliographic record so that a library's local system can create both order and item records automatically. The order record number can also be provided to allow the overlay of the order record in local systems. Another new feature gives libraries the option to receive separate files for approval-plan titles and firm-order titles while allowing vendors to mix firm and approval titles in one manifest, simplifying shipping, which can reduce the shipping costs charged back to libraries.

Label Program Version 1.10 Now Available

In October 1997, OCLC introduced the OCLC Cataloging Label Program. A new version is now available to OCLC Cataloging members. As with the earlier version, this is available at NO CHARGE. This new version includes an enhancement to allow you to "unmark" labels previously selected for batch printing and resolves some reported problems. This version can be installed as an upgrade to Version 1.00 or as a new install. The Label Program is a 32-bit Windows-based product which requires either Microsoft Windows 95 or Windows NT (version 3.51 with Service Pack 5, or higher). For more information about the Label Program functionality or to take a Guided Tour of the product, see the Label Program home page on the OCLC Web site at http://www.purl.oclc.org/oclc/label. The Label Program Version 1.10 is now available electronically via the OCLC Web site and anonymous FTP.

REFERENCE SERVICES

OCLC EPIC and FirstSearch Services Merger

OCLC will integrate the OCLC EPIC and FirstSearch services. When the two services are merged in July 1999, the EPIC service will no longer be accessible. On February 9, 1998, OCLC sent a letter of notification to each EPIC subscriber. OCLC already has taken the following actions with regard to the EPIC/FirstSearch integration:

- The EPIC annual fee was discontinued in December 1997.
- The loading of new EPIC databases was discontinued in December 1997; however, current EPIC databases will continue to be updated through July 1999.
- EPIC promotional literature and documentation updates have been discontinued.
- New EPIC orders are discouraged; they will not be accepted as of April 3, 1998.

Among the benefits to libraries and their users of integrating EPIC into FirstSearch are:

- Access to the same quality of information with new databases being added frequently.
- More full-text articles available online.
- Graphical user interface with a World Wide Web browser.
- Similar searching and retrieval power in a format appropriate for all levels of staff and users.
- E-mail capabilities for citations and full text.
- Document ordering and interlibrary loan.
- Integration with OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online.

(From John Sullivan, OCLC Online Reference Services)

Connie Zuga Named Vice President For Reference Services

Connie Zuga has been named vice president for reference services at OCLC, effective 1997 October 27. Ms. Zuga has
been with Knight-Ridder Information (formerly Dialog Information Services), in Mountain View, California, since 1979, most recently as vice president--Year 2000 Project. At Dialog, Ms. Zaga has held a number of key posts, including: vice president, business content; vice president, licensing; vice president, database development; director, business information division; manager, marketing and sales information; staff product analyst; and database specialist, customer services. Prior to joining Dialog, she was a cataloger at Georgetown University Medical Center, head librarian at the Population Reference Bureau, and library director at the Bureau of Social Science Research. Ms. Zaga holds a master's degree in sociology from Georgetown University, a master's in librarianship from San Jose State University, and bachelor of arts and science degrees in education from Ohio State University.

Social Science and Humanities Publishers Add Journals to OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online

Four additional publishers--Jossey-Bass Publishers, the Ohio State University Press, Plenum Publishing, and Sage Publications--have agreed to contribute their journals to the OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online service. Libraries using Electronic Collections Online subscribe to journals directly with publishers or subscription agents and access them remotely through the World Wide Web at OCLC's headquarters in Dublin, Ohio. End users of Electronic Collections Online can search, browse, and display article citations for all journals available through the service and display abstracts or complete articles for journals to which their library subscribes. Users can browse lists of journals, selected issues or a selected topic area. Founded in 1967, Jossey-Bass publishes peer-reviewed and professional journals, magazines and newsletters in higher and adult education, business, nonprofit and public management, psychology, and education [www.jbp.com]. The Ohio State University Press publishes journals in the humanities and the social sciences aimed at a professional scholarly audience. Each journal has been approved by the editorial board that governs the Ohio State University Press imprint. The journals, published in cooperation with Ohio State University, reach audiences in a broad range of academic disciplines [www.sbs.ohio-state.edu/osu-press]. Now in its second half-century as one of the premier publishers in the scientific, technical, biomedical, and behavioral science areas, Plenum Publishing provides cutting-edge information via its various journals, books, and electronic database products to the global community of scientists, researchers, academics, clinicians, and other professionals [http://ps1.infor.com:6800]. Sage Publications was founded on the principle of publishing by scholars and for scholars in the social sciences. For more than 30 years, Sage has maintained its commitment to education by publishing only for educational purposes. Today, Sage publishes more than 200 journals and hundreds of new book titles each year on three continents [www.sagepub.com].

Academic Press to Make Journals Available Through OCLC Electronic Collections Online

Academic Press, one of the world's largest publishers of scientific information, will broaden its online delivery activity by partnering with the OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online service. Licensed libraries may use Electronic Collections Online as a gateway to the Academic Press International Digital Electronic Access Library (IDEAL) for access to all 175 Academic Press scientific research journals. Academic Press, a division of Harcourt Brace and Company, is an international publisher of high-quality journals, book serials, major reference works, databases, textbooks, and monographs [http://www.apnet.com]. Academic Press International Digital Electronic Access Library [http://www.idealibrary.com] and [http://www.europe.idealibrary.com] has been making its 175 journals available in electronic form since January 1996 to many library consortia around the world.

Johns Hopkins University Press to Join OCLC Electronic Collections Online

Johns Hopkins University Press, a pioneer in electronic scholarly publishing, has agreed to make its Project Muse journals accessible to users of the OCLC FirstSearch Electronic Collections Online service. Beginning in 1998, library users will have seamless access to all 43 journals from Johns Hopkins University Press through Electronic Collections Online. The Johns Hopkins University Press and the Milton S. Eisenhower Library developed Project Muse to enable worldwide networked access to the full text of scholarly journals published by the press. Project Muse makes works of scholarship more widely available within individual university communities by using online technology to produce affordable electronic journals in the humanities and social sciences. In 1998, OCLC will begin linking the 65 databases from the OCLC FirstSearch service with the full-text journals available on Electronic Collections Online to create a fully integrated system for library users. Founded in 1878 in Baltimore, Maryland, Johns Hopkins University Press is the oldest university press in continuous operation in North America. It is also one of the largest university presses, publishing some 170 new books and 43 journals each year.

Periodicals Contents Index Added to FirstSearch

Periodicals Contents Index, a database published by Chadwyck-Healey that indexes the contents of pre-1991 issues of periodicals in the humanities and social sciences, was added to the OCLC FirstSearch service in December 1997. Periodicals Contents Index makes it possible to search back
volumes of journals with the same ease and convenience as more recently published ones. It contains journals in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and other Western languages, and includes the complete table of contents for each issue of each journal. Every year, Periodicals Contents Index adds records for more than 1 million articles. It already covers more than 2,076 journals and includes records for more than 8.5 million articles. It will grow to encompass 3,500 journals and 15 million articles. Periodicals Contents Index will be offered in two editions: Complete, with coverage from 1770 to 1990/91; and Subset, with coverage from 1960/61 to 1990/91. The full file will be available on FirstSearch via subscription only; the subset will be available under all FirstSearch pricing options. The current complete list of titles is on Chadwyck-Healey's PCI Home Page: http://pci.chadwyck.com/titles/titles.html or http://pci.chadwyck.co.uk/titles/titles.html. Periodicals Contents Index will include a link to OCLC holdings and OCLC Interlibrary Loan via FirstSearch.

University of Nice Sophia-Antipolis Makes FirstSearch Available

Following a trial of the OCLC FirstSearch service, the University Library of Nice Sophia-Antipolis is now providing access to the FirstSearch Base Package for its students and faculty. In 1988, the library of the University of Nice became one of the first university libraries in France to become an OCLC member. Since then, the library has conducted a major retrospective conversion of materials and has recently begun using the OCLC Interlibrary Loan service. The University of Nice Libraries comprises a central library with seven separate geographic locations and specialized libraries in individual departments, institutes, and laboratories. The libraries’ mission is to obtain the information in all forms necessary for teaching and research, to ensure a universal access to this documentation, and to coordinate the purchasing policy of the Bibliothèque Universitaire and the specialized libraries.

RESOURCE SHARING

Florida Libraries, SOLINET, and OCLC to Build a Distance Learning Library

Community college, university, and public libraries in Florida, along with the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET) and OCLC, are building an electronic library to support the emerging distance education programs in Florida’s higher education community. The Florida Distance Learning Library Initiative provides Florida’s community college and university students with desktop access to a rich electronic collection of databases and library catalogs. Using the Internet and World Wide Web, students connect to the online collection from their homes, and classrooms—or from the nearest community college, university, or public library. When fully implemented, the distance learning library will include scholarly electronic journals, online class reserve materials, electronic course syllabuses, patron-initiated interlibrary loan, and computerized reference and referral services. For the Distance Learning Library Initiative, OCLC is providing access to databases on the OCLC FirstSearch service and OCLC SiteSearch software for managing local and remote resources under one interface for a single point of access and for creating and loading databases.

OCLC ILL Direct Request Allows User-Initiated, Library-Controlled Interlibrary Loan

With the new OCLC ILL Direct Request service, libraries can allow their users to initiate requests and send them directly to the OCLC Interlibrary Loan service. The first user-initiated request was placed at the University of Minnesota, and the University of Michigan filled the request. Both institutions are participants in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), which comprises 12 major teaching and research university libraries. The CIC Virtual Electronic Library uses OCLC online services and software, including Direct Request, to share resources. With Direct Request, a library user searches and locates materials through an electronic service, such as an online union catalog or the OCLC FirstSearch service. External software, such as OCLC SiteSearch WebZ software, authenticates the end user and sends the request to OCLC in an ISO-compliant message. The OCLC ILL system processes the request, according to Web-based profiles the library has determined, and sends the request to the first potential lender. The OCLC ILL Direct Request service is an option for libraries that participate in the OCLC Interlibrary Loan service. Direct Request automates the interlibrary loan process to improve productivity by expanding interlibrary loan services and reducing staff work.

Korea Research Information Center Delivers OCLC Services to Korean Institutions

Korea Research Information Center (KRIC) has begun delivering OCLC cataloging and reference services to 164 universities and research institutions in the Republic of Korea. KRIC, which was created in December 1996 by the Korean Ministry of Education as an affiliated institute to the Korea Research Foundation, delivers information to the country’s research and higher education community. Professors and researchers of 164 universities and research institutions in Korea now access the OCLC FirstSearch service via the Internet. KRIC also uses the OCLC Cataloging service to build and maintain the national union catalog, obtaining MARC records for libraries in Korea when the records are not available locally.
GPO will Make ERIC Reports Available Online in FDLP/ERIC Digital Library Pilot Project

The Government Printing Office (GPO), National Library of Education (NLE), and OCLC are cooperating in a pilot project to make public-domain reports from the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) available to libraries online, without charge, through the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). The FDLP/ERIC Digital Library Pilot Project, scheduled to start in 1998, will give participants information on managing a large, high-demand collection of full-text documents in an electronic environment. The Pilot Project is one of several GPO partnership arrangements that match government information producers with library and other institutional resources for electronic storage, dissemination, and access. ERIC reports in TIFF format are indexed for storage in eight robotic automated cartridge systems that can handle more than 4 terabytes of information in each system. With a total of 32 terabytes, the storage systems can hold some 12.8 billion typewritten pages and are housed at OCLC in Dublin, Ohio.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Compiled by Jay Weitz

Q: Some time ago, I had sent in a type code change request for OCLC #11193392, which is entitled "Mel Bay's dulcimer chord encyclopedia." I wanted it changed from "c" to "a." It seems to me that chord diagrams are generally treated as books by LC, not as scores. For example, see #31520339, Neal Hellman's "Dulcimer chord book." I can find other examples, especially of guitar chord books, if need be, to support this argument. You said something in the latest MOUG Newsletter (no. 68) about this very issue, where you leaned towards scores format for such items. The item in question really is not in musical notation. It has a representation of the fret board of a dulcimer with dots where the fingers are to be placed to give the chord, represented as a letter symbol at the top of the diagram. Do you really think that is a type of score?

A: In various Q&A over the years, I have said to consider such items as scores even when they do not have traditional staff notation. To my mind, this seemed in line with other things that do not have staff notation but are still considered scores (scores that consist entirely of performance notes, all sorts of graphic notation, etc.) As backup evidence, I found numerous LC records that seem to treat such guitar chord collections as scores, but there were as many where they were treated as books. As I so often do when it comes to the REALLY difficult questions, I deferred to the Library of Congress. Deta Davis was kind enough to provide the following definitive A: "You might not like my answer since it contradicts your position. We do not consider chord diagram books to be scores if they are exclusively chord diagram books. We even have a policy statement to that effect at the beginning of the Music-File Input-Update Manual under "Scope of the Music File." The relevant passage in that internal LC document is quite explicit, had I thought to refer to it: "Records for books and book-like materials relating to music but whose primary content is not music notation, such as librettos, songbooks without music, books of chord diagrams, etc., reside in the BOOKSM file." That is, they are coded as Type "a." We treat them as books. If a piece of music is written in chord diagrams or a chord diagram book had enough music in it to be considered music, then we would consider it a score. Another way of looking at it is, since the chord diagram books generally are not musical compositions but information on playing an instrument, then they should not be treated as music. As a result of [this] query I examined our practice and discovered some recent chord diagram books cataloged in the Music File as scores. We will be correcting those records and sending a reminder to the catalogers of what the appropriate treatment should be.

Q: I'm cataloging a CD of Marian Anderson singing. All the recordings were made between 1928 and 1939. The copy I have put "mono." in the 300, though that info is not on the item anywhere. AACR2 says to "give the number of sound channels if the information is readily available." I guess if you happen to know that stereo was not used until the late 1950's that info is readily available to you. But if you hadn't happened across that fact, putting no info about sound channels in the 300 would also be correct. Right? Same business with =n of 007. BF&S gives a nice little history of sound recording techniques in the instructions for when to use the various codes. Considering the dates of recording on this CD, it seems likely that "b", "direct storage, not acoustical" was the method used. (The earliest recording, from 1928, might even be "a", acoustical) The item has a SPARS code of ADD (also says the sound was transferred from the original 78s and digitally remastered). Usually ADD is my cue to code =n as "e". But BF&S, in its little history, says analog electrical storage didn't exist until the late 1940's. So would =n a "b" be best here? By the way, I listened to a couple of the tracks. You do hear music through both channels but as far as I can tell it is the same music, i.e., not more bass on one and more treble on the other. That is, mono sound manipulated to come out both speakers on your stereo system so it sounds a little more balanced in your living room. Sound reasonable? (Pardon the unintentional pun.)

A: Since you are not supposed to be required to go beyond the item itself for such information, if the item does not say either "mono." or "stereo." you may leave out the information all together in the 300. Since you know what you know about recording history and can confirm it with your ears and maybe a set of headphones, you may supply the correct designation. But you don't have to. That first "A" in the SPARS code
signifies that analog technology was used in the original recording session. One suspects that in the SPARS definition, "analog" covers everything pre-digital (or even non-digital), so you may need your knowledge of the history to correctly code 007 subfield t3 (if you choose not to use "u"). Chances are "b" is correct. Even monaural sound will come out of both speakers/channels. It's just that both will sound exactly the same, without any of the "channel separation" that creates the illusion of stereophonic sound.

Q: We are contemplating a digital library project which will involve digitizing about 70 published items of various formats (sheet music, books, government documents) which relate to the assassination, funeral, and burial of Abraham Lincoln. We are wondering if for those items which already have records in OCLC if we can add an 856 field which indicates an electronic address for an online version of the item. Our serials department says that they do that for serials.

A: Sounds like a wonderful idea to me. The current version of LC's "Guidelines for the Use of Field 856" (revised August 1997) is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/856guide.html. OCLC's own Cataloging Electronic Resources: OCLC-MARC Coding Guidelines (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/bit/212/feb98.htm#Cataloging_Electronic_Resources) should also be consulted. OCLC has also recently implemented the latest changes to the 856 field that are outlined in the introductory paragraphs of the LC "Guidelines" (the First Indicator values "blank" and "4" and the Second Indicator), although LC and others may not have. Revisions have been made to OCLC's electronic documentation and the changes are outlined in both OCLC System News and in the March 1998 issue of "Bits & Pieces" available on the OCLC Web site (for which I do not have an address at this writing).

The second edition of Nancy Olson's Cataloging Internet Resources (http://www.oclc.org/oclc/man/9256cat/oc.htm or http://www.purl.org/oclc/cataloging-internet) is now available and should also be consulted.

Q: I have a question about the 740 tag, subfield +h [GMD]. I seem to recall reading on AUTOCAT that in "Bibliographic Formats and Standards" there is a misprint and that subfield +h can be used in OCLC, although "Bibliographic Formats and Standards" says 'do not use'. I could not find this message searching the AUTOCAT archives, so could you please clarify this for me. Is that a misprint?

A: No, it's not a misprint. Subfield +h for GMDs +h should be used only in the 245 field. LCRI 25.5D says not to use GMDs in uniform titles. Not using GMDs in the 740 and other added entries is covered in LCRI 21.29: "Although a general material designation (GMD) is given in the title and statement of responsibility area (LCRI 1.1C), do not use a GMD in added entries, including added entries for titles, series, and related works."

Q: I want to make sure what "those given prominence (by wording or layout) in the chief source of information of the item being catalogued" actually means. I have a CD with a title "The art of Furtwängler". The names of performers are listed on the chief source with equal prominence and in the order 1. Berliner Philharmoniker, 2. Wiener Philharmoniker, 3. Furtwängler. I consider Furtwängler to be given prominence since his name is in the title. A colleague insists that considering names of performers, he is given equal prominence with the other two names, so these three are all to be considered as principal performers.

A: The definition you cite is that for "principal performers," which constitutes Footnote 5 in AACR2 Rule 21.23 (page 344). The issue is further discussed, if not exactly further clarified, in RI 21.23C, where the possibility of confusion is admitted. The relevant passages from the rule interpretation reads: "When two or more performers are named in the chief source of information, consider to be principal performers those given the greatest prominence there. If all the performers named in the chief source of information are given equal prominence there, consider all of them to be principal performers...." In judging relative prominence on the basis of wording, layout, and typography, consider names printed in the same size and style of lettering and in association with one another to have equal prominence. When names appear in the same size and style of lettering but in different areas of the same source of information, consider those in a location implying superiority (e.g., a higher position) to have greater prominence. Do not consider names near the beginning of a list or sequence to have greater prominence than those near the end." Not having the item in hand, I can only speculate about wording, layout, and typography, of course. But in general, I would consider mention of a name in the collective title/title proper to constitute greater prominence on the basis of wording (certainly), layout (probably), and typography (possibly). As I read them, neither the rule nor the RI excludes the title from consideration of "prominence." Rule 0.8 states: "The word prominently (used in such phrases as prominently named and stated prominently) means that a statement to which it applies must be a formal statement found in one of the prescribed sources on information (see 1.0A) for areas 1 and 2 for the class of material to which the item being catalogued belongs." I would interpret that to include the title and so consider Furtwängler to be the principal performer.

Q: If there are two or three principal performers, the rules say to enter under the first named. Usually the first named is a solo instrumentalist or vocalist, and it's OK. But in the case of orchestral music, the conductor's name sometimes comes first, and sometimes follows the orchestra's. In our library we prefer to enter under the conductor's name even
if the orchestra is named first. As I find on p. 346 of AACR2r, a main entry under the heading for the orchestra, our practice may not be legal. Is it seriously illegal?

A: Since you ask about conductor and orchestra, you must be referring to AACR2 Rule 21.23C1 ("Works by different persons or bodies. Collective title") rather than Rule 21.23D1a ("Works by different persons or bodies. No collective title" [for works in the popular idiom]). Both of these rules include the identical text: "If there are two or three persons or bodies represented as principal performers, enter under the heading for the first named and make added entries under the heading(s) for the other(s)." Remember that you must take into consideration much of what was discussed in the previous question about determining prominence: wording, layout, and typography. So if either the conductor or the orchestra appears more prominently, the decision about principal performer would have to go with the more prominent of the two. If they are equally prominent according to the RI and definitions, the first named would be the proper choice, strictly speaking. But it's probably not a terribly serious violation of AACR2 to arbitrarily choose the conductor in all such circumstances, all other things being equal. In this era of computerization, the concept of the "main entry" is often considered something of an anachronism, anyway. As long as all the necessary access points are present, I wouldn't lose any sleep over it.

Q: To follow up. Choice of entry rules are complicated. Today access points can be more-or-less equal in OPACs and we don't have to file cards anymore, so is it still necessary to agonize on which is the main entry? What is the point in making and maintaining such complicated rules on the choice of entry?

A: In most systems, the choice of main entry still has some impact on how entries look in full displays as well as how they sort in all kinds of ordered (brief, truncated, group) displays. The whole concept of "main entry" came up for discussion at the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR, which took place in Toronto in late October 1997. The Web site for the conference, the papers presented, and the electronic discussions that took place before the conference is at http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/index.htm. As the results of the conference continue to filter out, I'm sure there will be even more information at the Web site as well as discussion papers and possible rule changes. In the meantime, be aware that the question is getting serious discussion and that change is likely on the way.

Q: What exactly is the "SPARS" code?

A: "SPARS" stands for the Society of Professional Audio Recording Services, the organization that created what we know informally as the "SPARS code" in the early 1980s. You can read more about the organization on their Web site at http://www.badanimals.com/users/spars/. Here is what the Web site has to say about the SPARS code: "[T]t was designed for use with CD releases to delineate exactly which parts of the recording process were digital and which were analog. This program consisted of a series of guidelines set down by SPARS and given to CD manufacturers so that they might mark their product honestly and precisely. This program flourished until the early 1990's when the digital/analog technical scene became so cluttered with conversions and algorithms for interface as to resemble rocket science. The simple code was no longer able to carry enough information to be meaningful. SPARS withdrew endorsement of the code in 1991, although some labels still use it today." The three-character code appears on many CDs, usually on the packaging or on the disc label itself. I am told that the code also appears occasionally on audio cassettes. "D" stands for "digital" and "A" for "analog."

The three positions correspond to the technology used in the original sound capture, in subsequent mixing and editing, and in the mastering, respectively. The most common codes are: DDD, indicating that digital technology was used in the original recording session, in subsequent mixing and editing, and in the mastering; ADD, indicating that analog technology was used in the original recording session, but digital technology was used in subsequent mixing and editing, and in the mastering; and AAD, indicating that analog technology was used in the original recording session and in subsequent mixing and editing, but digital technology was used in the mastering. The first position of the code may be useful in determining the correct value for field 007 subfield 2 ("Capture and storage technique"). The remaining two positions of the code are not useful for cataloging.

Q: What is a matrix number and how do you distinguish one from other issue numbers?

A: A matrix number is the unique numeric or alphanumeric sequence assigned by the sound recording publisher or manufacturer to the matrix or mold used to stamp one side of a pre-CD recording. (Since CDs are single sided, there is no need to distinguish sides.) Matrix numbers usually appear etched into the sound recording surface between the inner grooves and the label, but they also sometimes are printed on the label itself. When printed on the label, they usually appear either in conjunction with the manufacturer's numbers (generally in parentheses -- I recall many older Columbia discs like this) or as the only identification. It is in this latter instance when catalogers need to pay attention to matrix numbers. Richard Smiraglia's 1989 text Music Cataloging (p. 22) suggests that matrix numbers are distinguished from publisher's numbers in that matrix numbers usually differ for each side of the disc. In years past, matrix numbers often contained coded information about the recording session, the pressing plant, take numbers, and so on. In that respect, they can be valuable for archival and historical purposes.
Q: AACR2 rev. 5.7B18 reads "If the works in a collection are all in the same musical form and that form is named in the title proper of the item, do not repeat the musical form in the titles in the contents note". Rule 6.7B18 doesn't refer to this. Can we apply 5.7B18 in cataloging sound recordings? I understand that the rules proceed from the general to the specific in AACR2 and that we have to consult Chapter 1 as well as Chapter 6 in cataloging sound recordings. Generally speaking, can we consult Chapter 5 (Music in cataloging sound recordings and the other way round?

A: Borrowing concepts from one chapter of AACR2 to use in another is a time-honored and often useful practice. It is also in keeping with one of the cardinal principles of the rules, that of trying to treat all types of materials alike as much as possible. This borrowing is supported by a passage in Rule 0.23: "Use the chapters in part I alone or in combination as the specific problem demands." Why this particular (and common) circumstance was brought up in reference to scores but not sound recordings is anyone's guess, but you can safely apply the idea to contents notes in both formats.

Q: I'm working on some more vinyl, mostly 45s and have one by Dave Kennedy (he is the performer; doing 32 instruments himself). I have him as main entry, but he also co-wrote the "A" side, "Pizza pie". The flip side is "Wait 'til the sun shines, Nelly." Should the co-writer and Kennedy get author/title entries? I would think the Kennedy 100 would be enough. I traced the wrong spelled "Wait..." in a 740 and did an author/title for "Wait..." author. As a general rule, all authors on these 45s receive author/titles tracing, right? It's the songwriter/performer deal I'm wondering about.

A: LCRI 21.29D for Sound Recordings says, in part, "If a performer for whom an added entry would be made ... is also the composer of one or more works on the recording, make an added entry to represent the performing function in addition to any name/title access points (main entry or analytical added entries) made for his or her works.". The rules, RIs, and MCDs about added entries are seriously convoluted, but as far as I have been able to disentangle, I think the co-composer (assuming shared responsibility as defined in the AACR2 glossary and enumerated in Rule 21.6 and that Kennedy is named first) would get a simple name added entry (21.6B2 and 21.0B1). The author/title added entry for "Wait..." sounds fine.

Q: On bracketed dates, is there ever a "p" or "c" situation such as [p1967] or [c1982]? I never see it, and I guess it's because we don't know if it should be "p" or "c"?

A: Brackets are used for transcribed areas in only a limited number of situations, mainly to correct inaccuracies (Rule 1.0F1) and to indicate that information is taken from outside the prescribed source(s) (Rule 1.0A1 and elsewhere). Since the prescribed sources for the publication, distribution, etc. area of Sound Recordings (6.0B2) include "Chief source of information [disc and label, and as outlined in 6.0B1 for other recording formats], accompanying textual material, container," it would be rare for an explicit phonogram copyright date (a "p" date) to be bracketed. Remember, that if publishers are doing things correctly (always a questionable assumption), a run of the mill copyright date (a "c" date) should not refer to a recording itself but to something else associated with the recording, be it package design, program notes, accompanying material, or whatever. As such, these "c" dates can be used only as inferred dates of publication and so must be bracketed, but without the "c" designation. I highly recommend Richard Smiraglia's new Describing Music Materials (Soldier Creek Press, 1997), which has a clear and concise section about dates on pages 48-49.

Q: Because of time and money pressures, I don't often have time to do complete tracings for composers and uniform titles for sound recordings. Instead, we rely on the 505, often using the "enhanced" contents note subfielding. What's your reaction to that? Do those subfields automatically disregard the articles?

A: As far as "enhanced" contents notes are concerned, different systems could be designed to do different things with all of that subfielding. There may be systems that can ignore initial articles in the 505, but I'm not aware of any. As a matter of fact, in OCLC, only 505 subfield +a is indexed for keyword searches at the present time (see the recent "Searching for Bibliographic Records" document). Because the 505 subfields +t, +t, and +g are fairly recent additions to the format, you should make sure that your own local system knows what to do with them. Under no circumstances should you think of the "enhanced" contents note as a substitute for title or name/title added entries where they are appropriate.

Q: About your answer to the question on the Smithsonian/Microsoft "Crossroad" CD in the MOUG Newsletter no. 67 (p. 12, first question), it is my understanding that we are supposed to (and would want to) add a field 007 whenever possible. In the case of this audio CD/CD-ROM I would want to catalog it as a sound recording, add the 538 and 006 for computer files, in addition to any other informational 500 note describing the enhanced status, and also add field 007 for computer files. Do you see this last step as somehow redundant or unnecessary or not valuable? It was my understanding that 007s could (perhaps not should?) be added for every format possible. In other words if the 006 could have a corresponding 007 (not always possible), add it. Clarification?
A: Once again, bibliographic realities have overtaken the bibliographic format. To be honest, I've wondered the same question and have tried to avoid it. Historically, the 007 field has been a coded extension of the physical description field. There were cases where multiple 007's would be appropriate: for kits, when multiple physical items are being described; when multiple aspects of an item (most commonly, the presence of both mono- and stereo. tracks on the same sound recording or color and black-and-white sequences in the same film or video) required multiple 007's for each aspect to be coded; and when the same item is issued in more than one format and all are cataloged or mentioned in the same record (we generally don't do this much any longer). My first inclination was to say that, since this is one physical item, only one 007 would be needed. But as I think it through, this seems analogous to the second instance I mentioned, where multiple aspects of a single physical item could be brought out by multiple 007's. There is a fair amount of overlap between the Sound Recording 007 and the Computer File 007 (here, the information on dimensions corresponds, the SMDs tell us essentially the same thing). The only substantive information the CF 007 tells us that the REC 007 doesn't is the color characteristics. But I guess that's enough to justify multiple 007's.

Q: The instructions in BF&S for field 024 state that ten digits of the UPC should be recorded. Many users have been adding the other two digits on various records they have entered. Is there some sort of error in BF&S? Are the ten digit examples in USMARC incorrect when the first indicator is 1? Should all twelve digits be transcribed even if the numbers appear in different sizes?

A: The ten-digit Universal Product Code (UPC) examples are probably incorrect. In one of life's minor but interesting ironies, the standards for entering these "standard" numbers into USMARC records have changed over the years. For a long time, USMARC and BF&S called for omitting certain digits when transcribing some standard numbers. More recently, guidelines stipulate that all eye-readable digits be transcribed. As a result, 024 fields in some older records may contain less-than-complete standard numbers, many of which may appear to violate the very standard they are supposed to represent. Additionally, until the scope of the 024 field was expanded with Format Integration, some standard numbers (such as the European Article Number) were ignored altogether. To complicate things further, some publishers have been careless about printing standard numbers in their entirety, sometimes omitting a first digit and/or a final check digit. There may also be other discrepancies between the number printed on an item and the scanned bar code that accompanies it. The Second Indicator has been defined to account for differences between eye-readable codes and the corresponding scanned bar codes. Being able to code the Second Indicator accurately presupposes that the cataloger has access to some sort of bar code reading apparatus. What you should do now is transcribe all twelve digits of the UPC, without any of the hyphens and spaces that appear in its printed version.

Q: I am puzzled why OCLC will not allow a non-numerical 028 publisher "number". I have a recording with "EKL BOX A -- EKL BOX H" as the publisher number, and nothing else. Yet I continually receive the dreaded error message telling me this is invalid. I suppose I can get around all this 028 nonsense and put the thing as an unformatted publisher number) in a 500 note, but this won't allow for "mm:" searching. Anything else to be done?

A: The error validation routines built into OCLC's implementation of the 028 field expect all alphabetic characters to be identical on both sides of the double hyphen. That works great in preventing typos in the most common instances where there are ranges of alphabetic prefixes followed by numerals. But unfortunately, the same safeguards stymie the less common situation that you have, where a range is alphabetic instead of numeric. To get correct indexing, you can either input separate 028 fields for each "number" (EKL BOX A, EKL BOX B, etc.) if you don't exceed record or field restrictions, or you can alternatively string all of these together in a single 028 field, each "number" separated by a comma-space. In each case, you'll probably want to input an explicit 500 note with a simplified version of the range.

Q: G. Ricordi publications often carry a copyright date (sometimes 2 or 3) and a "Ristampa" date of 10, 20, or 30 years later. I've always ignored these dates and just recorded the latest copyright date (if there was more than one), figuring that the date more copies were run was bibliographically unimportant. However, maybe I'm misinterpreting 1.4F6 and the LCRI for it. Should the printing date be considered a date of manufacture as explained in LCRI 1.4F6, point 3? If so, then BF&S, under DISt, would be "s" and the PRINTING date would go in Date 1, with the copyright date in Date 2 (see BF&S page FF:27). Or have I been a music cataloger too long and I'm getting myself mixed up?

A: Those Ricordi "Ristampa" dates are problematical and people have treated them all sorts of different ways over the years. All other things being equal, my inclination is to disregard them all together (which one might take to be the implication of LCRI 1.4G4 when things are reprinted frequently over long periods) or include them only in the 260 subfield $g$ as a printing date (as shown in LCRI 1.4F6, point 3). If you transcribe the date in subfield $g$, DISt remains "s" and only the latest copyright date appears as Date 1, with Date 2 blank. (There's an example, complicated by other factors, at the top of BF&S p. FF:27.) If you can determine that there is some real bibliographic significance to the "reprinting" that
would make the item, in essence, a new edition, regard the latest printing date to be an implied (and bracketed) date of publication with the latest copyright date following. In this case you would use Date "t" with the bracketed date in Date 1 and the copyright date in Date 2. Such instances might be full score versus miniature score, new front matter, etc.

Q: Are "In-Analytics" still acceptable? I have a collection of 16th to 19th-century songs, most of which appear in no other source, for which I need to provide direct access to each item. We have expanded NOTIS so that I could add the 71 added entries, but, of course, OCLC could not accept such a record. The only alternative I can think of is the in-analytic. As I was searching the OCLC manual, however, I could find nothing about this practice (especially since I expected to find a special 5XX field for the "in" note). Is this still acceptable, and, if so, are there any special considerations, other than AACR2 rules, that I need to know?

A: In Analytics are still acceptable when appropriate, but as LCRI 13.5 suggests, they should be used only in special cases. There is a brief section in the introductory part of "Bibliographic Formats and Standards," 2nd ed., p. 36, that deals with them. You'll also need to look at field 773 and review AACR2r Chapter 13. A few things to remember about In Analytics: If there is no record for the host item, you should create one along with the Analytics (and cite it in the analytical 773s). It isn't necessary to analyze every element in the host item; you may be selective, if you wish. You should omit the 260 unless the information would differ from that found in the 773 subfield t.d. Since you will be creating a large number of records that will have at least some common information (the fixed field, some of the notes and subject headings, and the 773), I'd suggest using the constant data capability (described in "Cataloging User Guide," 2nd ed., Chapter 7). It'll save you lots of typing. Depending on the host item you're cataloging, there may be another alternative to Analytics. If the item has some sort of logical subdivisions (volumes, chapters, etc.), you might be able to catalog each of those subdivisions separately and link them with "With" notes (as we commonly did with sound recordings, pre-AACR2). That is a sort of funky way to do it, but sometimes desperate scores call for desperate measures.

Q: What is the proper capitalization for titles in the 245 field of AV materials? I quoted AACR2 saying only the first word is capitalized even if it's an article, unless it is a personal name, etc. There seem to be a lot of AV records in WorldCat that have the second word capitalized, and I wanted to know what OCLC policy is.

A: Only the first word of a title (in English) is capitalized, even if it is an article. You will see many records in WorldCat with the second word capitalized, and will hear lots of confusion on the matter, because the original text of AACR2, 1988 revision, said (Rule A.4D1): "If an article is the first word of the title proper and the main entry is under the title proper ..., also capitalize the next word" (p. 568). Of course, the title is most often the main entry in Visual Materials records. With the "Amendments 1993," however, Rules A.4A through A.4H were deleted and had new versions of them substituted, eliminating the capitalization of the second word when the title is the main entry. The Amendments are also full of changed capitalizations throughout the text, which are repercussions from that revision.

Q: I'm staring at a score (2 parts, actually) of violin duets by Haydn, published by International Music Co. The title page appears as follows:

HAYDN
THREE DUETS
(from three String Quartets)
For Two Violins
I have copy on OCLC that is a match except for the title, substituting "op. 99" for the parenthetical phrase. The copy and my score have the same plate number, consist of two violin parts, and have no date (the copy has guessed at "[197-?]", which is as good as anything else). According to OCLC's guidelines, I guess I'm justified in putting in a new record. The question is larger than this one record, however. International has this type of problem a lot. A few weeks ago, I had a similar problem where the LC cataloging copy had the Fanna number of a Vivaldi piece as part of the title, and my score did not. Recently, I had a score where the name of the editor was given in full, while the OCLC copy had only his last name. I suspect that the publishing practices of International are such that slightly different title pages and covers are prepared whenever more copies are run. But that's just my suspicion, and chief sources are chief sources. So my overall question is: How should these situations be treated? Does OCLC prefer a "when in doubt, don't" or "if the title is different, the item is different, put in a new record" approach. Or is there no opinion?

A: Of course, it's not just International Music Inc., but you know that. First thing to do is make sure you're taking into account all possible titles (title page, caption, cover, spine, list, etc.). Next, consider how the titles differ. Are we talking substantive differences, or mere differences in fullness of transcription? As you suggest, publishers are careless about these things. Unfortunately, there are no hard rules about what sort of difference really makes a difference. If I am looking at two records, the only difference being the absence of an opus number or thematic index number on one and its presence on the other, I'm probably going to consider them the same. Differences that we might readily recognize if we could compare both items right in front of us become much more blurry when all you've got are bibliographic records cataloged...
by different people (or even the same person) over a period of time, or one record and one item. This is where the old standby-copout "cataloger's judgment" comes in. Comparing OCLC #389584 with your item, yours has no opus number but does include the "(from three String Quartets)" designation. Those differences combined would probably justify separate records, but it's very difficult to generalize and I would urge you to use your good judgment.

Q: Can you direct me to whatever authority exists for the practice of adding a date in subfield 4 (f) to analytic entries for musical compositions? I see this in records for sound recordings all the time, but I can't find any reference to it in AACR2, in LCRIs, or in Richard Smiraglia's book (at least the edition I have).

A: Subfields 4(f) used to be added routinely to analytic entries for sound recordings, although the practice has been abandoned by most institutions in recent years. LC Rule Interpretation 21.30M stipulates adding the year of publication to analytical added entries for the Bible (25.18A) and the collective uniform titles "Works" (LCRI 25.8) and "Selections" (LCRI 25.9) only. If you follow this last reference, you will discover the instruction not to add the date (among other things) to the collective uniform title "Selections" when applying Rule 25.34B, regarding collections of various types of compositions by a single composer. Finally, LCRI 25.34B1 states, "Do not add a date of publication, etc., to the uniform title "Selections" when this is used for collections of musical works by one composer." In other words, current practice for sound recordings analytical added entries is to add the date only to Bible headings and to the collective uniform title "Works".

Q: It seems a particular idiosyncrasy of recordings (and specifically for those of popular music) to have on the label something like: "People will say we're in love" (Rodgers-Hammerstein) and I have been dutifully transcribing the 505s as: People will say we're in love / Rodgers ; Hammerstein.

with a semicolon separating the two names because I happen to know Rodgers has the role of composer and Hammerstein the lyricist on this particular song. Isn't this what we do in 245? Are we not to do this in the 505? Have I been leading our patrons astray all these years? If I do not know what function the various people have, whether both/all folks named are in effect a composing and writing team without separate roles in the process (and if I do not have my administration's blessing to take the time to find out), I have been fudging and simply separating the names by a comma e.g., "You must have been a beautiful baby / Mercer, Goodman." I am loathe to keep the thing "Mercer-Goodman" or "Mercer/Goodman" because that is an honor I think reserved for the Mendelssohn-Bartholdys of the world. Then of course, we see animals like "Tilton-Field-Jones." It certainly does not affect access or anything. In short, do you recommend keeping the hyphens between names as they appear on the label or container? And/or do you separate roles of responsibility by a semicolon?

A: The rules for statements of responsibility (composers and lyricists, primarily) in contents notes are pretty much the same as those for statements of responsibility in the title field. Rule 1.7A3 says in part, "If data in a note correspond to data found in the title and statement of responsibility ... give the elements of the data in the order in which they appear in those areas. In such a case, use prescribed punctuation ..." LCRI 2.7B18 also gives some details on creating formal contents notes. We may also refer back to the rules on statements of responsibility (6.1F, 1.1F) for guidance on how to formulate such statements. If the item says only "Rodgers-Hammerstein" or "Tilton-Field-Jones", you would transcribe them with space-semicolon-space, just as you would in the 245 field. This prescribed punctuation would properly be substituted for the hyphens or slashes. The relationship(s) between the name(s) and the title may be further clarified if you wish (and if you have the information, room, time, and patience) by bracketed explanations, but that's probably going beyond the call of duty.

505 0 Do-re-mi / Rodgers ; Hammerstein -- Blues in the night / Mercer ; Arlen .... or (for the ambitious or obsessive)

505 0 Do-re-mi / [music by] Rodgers ; [lyrics by] Hammerstein -- Blues in the night / [lyrics by] Mercer ; [music by] Arlen ....

Of course with keyword indexing, access could be affected by how 505s are transcribed.

Q: According to MCD 5.7B10, we are now to indicate durations in nautical time in 500 notes. How does this square with transcribing information as it appears on the item (spelled out, etc., as appropriate) in the 505 note? Seems a bit inconsistent, no?

A: Music Cataloging Decision 6.7B10 (and MCD 6.7B18, which says "For the forms of durations recorded in a formal contents note, see MCD 6.7B10") is pretty clear: "In a statement of duration in the note area, separate the digits representing hours, minutes, and seconds by colons. If a duration is expressed in seconds only, precede it by a colon." Durations are represented in the form "HH:MM:SS" in both 500 and 505 notes.
MOUG ANNUAL MEETING, PLENARY SESSION I

Musical Works on OCLC, or, What If OCLC Were Actually To Become a Catalog?

Martha M. Yee, UCLA Film and Television Archive

Report by Renée McBride, UCLA

In her stimulating presentation at the opening plenary session of MOUG's 20th Annual Meeting, Martha Yee addressed the issue of OCLC in its current form vs. OCLC's potential as a catalog from three angles:
1) an overview of current work in cataloging that could affect the cataloging of musical works;
2) a critical look at how OCLC currently indexes and displays musical works; and,
3) a discussion of theoretical issues underlying recommendations of the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Task Force on Works Intended for Performance and participants at the International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR (hereafter the Conference), at which Yee presented a paper that formed the foundation of her MOUG presentation.

The CC:DA is a body within the American Library Association (ALA) responsible for developing official ALA positions on additions to and revisions of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 1988 rev. (AACR2r). Yee presented an historical overview of the CC:DA Task Force and the Conference, convened by the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) in Toronto in October of 1997. The CC:DA Task Force recommendations, which deal with AACR rules 21.8-21.27, are located at http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~mrwatson/ccdadpage/perftrf.htm, and the Conference web site is at http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/index.htm. In addition to describing categories of Conference recommendations, the most important of which were determined to be Principles, Seriality, and Content vs. Carrier, Yee discussed her own personal recommendations to the JSC, which address principles implicit in AACR as well as specific rules in AACR Chapter 21, and which will be published in the forthcoming conference proceedings. The Conference recommendations generally suggest that AACR be more explicit so that its rules are easier to teach and understand, and Yee's recommendations and the JSC's published action items explore the issues of defining a work, multiple versions of works, works of mixed responsibility, relationships among works, and the internationalization of AACR.

Yee next examined how OCLC currently indexes and displays musical works, noting that relationships between a work and its various adaptations are currently unclear on OCLC. Among Yee's ideas for turning OCLC into a true catalog are:
1) Integrate the authority file into the online union catalog;
2) No search should fail due to overload;
3) When uniform titles are present, use them to organize displays, thus filing all editions of a work together;
4) Improve author, title, and author-title searching by expanding indexing of all relevant fields and subfields in both the authority and bibliographic files (Yee offered a number of specific suggestions in this category); and,
5) Develop compressed displays of a particular work that organize editions, performances, related works, works about it, etc., e.g. a display of Mozart's Zauberflöte might be organized into the following categories:
   a) Music scores
   b) Performances on sound recording
   c) Performances on video recording
   d) Films based on
   e) Other related works
   f) Works about

Discussion of theoretical issues underlying recommendations for changes to AACR and OCLC spanned Yee's entire presentation, culminating in lively participation by the audience. A particularly thought-provoking hypothesis put forth by Yee suggests that there are pure categories of content--e.g. music, moving image, computer programs--and that a work in one category cannot be transformed into a work in another category without becoming a new work. Testing this hypothesis through research could result in our being able to delineate the fundamental types of content, which might then bring us closer to defining the concept of 'work' and to determining when a previously existing work has been modified so much that it has become a new work.

Yee summarized the fundamental theoretical issues at hand in the form of three questions:
1) What is a musical work?
2) When does change occur that is substantial enough to create a new related musical work?
3) When are works that include a musical component actually works of mixed authorship more appropriately identified and cited by title than by original composer of the musical component?

Yee stressed that she did not intend to provide answers, but hoped that we might, noting that the cataloging community needs the music world's input, given that we have been dealing with these issues for a long time.
MOUG ANNUAL MEETING, PLENARY SESSION II

The Rest of Times, the Worst of Times: Celebrating the Past and Toasting the Future

Presented by Sheila S. Intner, Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science

Report by Suzanne Mudge, Indiana University

Trends affecting music cataloging and classification

Dr. Intner began her presentation by discussing significant trends affecting music cataloging and classification. She believes the most significant change over the last twenty years is the fact that bibliographic utilities, such as OCLC, are no longer simply processing data generated by catalogers who represent member libraries. They are true utilities in the sense that they generate their own data through internal spin-offs, such as TECHPRO, or by working with for-profit vendors. Intner further believes OCLC and other networks are moving into a new level of operation where there is an increase in specialized staff and a vested interest in music cataloging standards.

Citing the fact that many cataloging departments were de-professionalized in the 1980s, Intner described how the trend toward downsizing has also decimated staff size in local music library cataloging departments. As a result, local libraries increasingly turn to for-profit organizations for outsourcing as a way to continue to manage their cataloging. Intner noted that although outsourcing is now being practiced at a "different order of magnitude," it is a time-honored way of getting work done. Libraries have outsourced for 100 years, beginning with the purchase of cards from LC. Intner believes the problem is not that it costs more to do cataloging work in libraries, but that too often catalogers are not able to give unit costs to administrators, while an outside vendor can bring a price. Unless library catalogers can document that it costs less, they are underbid. Intner asserted that no library should spend more than $12.00 a record.

"Good" and "bad"

What is "good" is utilities are now true utilities that generate cataloging data. For-profit and non-profit vendors are gaining interest and expertise in quality cataloging of specialized music materials. Trained music library staff can focus their talents and expert knowledge on work other than routine cataloging.

What is "bad" is there is still the question of whether or not non-library music cataloging is as good as in-house work. There is also an overriding question of whether work based on maximizing profit can ever be as high quality as work based on serving user needs. Intner believes libraries can lobby with utilities and other for-profit vendors, and such resources will produce good quality work if librarians are vigilant. Music librarians need to be specific about what we need and we need to have reasonable expectations. Another issue is that some cataloging staff may not want to be redeployed to serve as public service staff; others love it. Many catalogers want to use their music scholarship in public service work and delight in accomplishing scholarly tasks. Intner likes to see an integration of cataloging and public service and thinks it is a valuable asset to those who are able to do both.

Effects of trends on the division of labor

Intner described how the division of labor in technical services areas is already changing in response to current trends. While non-MLS staff members are doing more music cataloging, the number of cataloging jobs for non-MLS staff members continues to dwindle. MLS librarians are performing many non-cataloging tasks such as managing OPACs, negotiating with vendors, training staff and patrons in use of new OPAC services, and managing network activities.

New requirements and directions for music library staff

While expectations for those with and without MLS degrees are changing, many skills now required for professional and non-professional staff were not acquired in MLS programs and were not taught to non-MLS librarians.

Today, degree-holding professionals need skills in communication, negotiation, finances, research, decision-making, teaching, planning, and institutional politics. Intner believes political skills are the hardest to learn and the most important to have. Music is generally not considered a "sexy" department. Music librarians need to plan, propose, and sell investments in access to administrators. Intner believes statistics are our "best friend." We need to monitor and evaluate data from outside sources; good data will help sell budgets. MLS librarians will increasingly be needed for their expertise in evaluation and selection (among a multitude of options) of finding tools. Furthermore, as departments increasingly look to vendors for cataloging needs, MLS-holding catalogers can use their skills to make sure the standard for outsourced cataloging remains high quality and useful.

MLS librarians will need to teach non-degree-holding staff additional skills in database searching and in copy cataloging, including a thorough understanding of descriptive cataloging elements and content analysis. Staff needs to know what is important to music scholars so that they, as catalogers, can include that information in catalog records.
The past twenty years, the next twenty years

Intner reviewed music cataloging accomplishments of the past twenty years and touched on future possibilities. Intner stated that the 1978 publication of AACR2, which made it possible to integrate rules for non-book and books, has become an all-time best seller in the library world. Music catalogers continue to be leaders in the field of cataloging. Intner cited well-known catalogers who have ensured the continuation of both well-trained catalogers and outstanding cataloging tools.

Intner believes the WWW will continue to work well with music materials. Increased access may include multimedia finding tools, "music stations" that provide instant communication and allow users to select from a range and combination of formats—notation, sound, and visual images, including AV incipits.

In conclusion, Intner displayed a brief summary of 1150 job ads from January 1996-July 1997. The breakdown for catalogers was 12.6% of the total. From that group, 14.8% were for those whose usual duties would be cataloging; 85.2% included management responsibilities; 9.7% were with for-profit organizations.

Questions & Answers

Q. My main concern with outsourced cataloging is that when cataloging was done in academic settings, catalogers had the research tools available to do the in depth work required to catalog correctly. How can vendors obtain the research resources they need to do proper music cataloging?

A. Vendors are trying hard to gather together staff with the expertise to tell them what they need. Very rarely do they balk at spending money on resources if they know they need them. Generally speaking, newer scholarly materials will be available on the web, the internet[,] or in electronic format. Vendors are faster at adopting that kind of data. It's the retrospective materials, older, historic materials that need to be purchased. Some vendors locate themselves near a great library or in an area where those resources are available. Vendors will have to do a good job or they will go out of business. This is the cost of doing business.

Q. If your vision of the future takes place and cataloging moves out of the library into vendor workshops, what will happen to the next generation of catalogers? Where will they come from? Where will new catalogers go to gain expertise?

A. Currently we are in an uncertain situation. Catalogers with specialized expertise are dwindling quickly. We don't have any real place for beginning catalogers to gain expertise from "master" music catalogers. Right now it is a level playing field. A few catalogers are located in a lot of places but a large number of catalogers are not located in one place together. If my vision of the future comes to pass (it is now only a trend), profit and non-profit vendors will grow in size and strength, in terms of expertise, and will become a locus for training a new generation of catalogers. While the new generation of catalogers may not be as high in number as the previous generation, it will be as high in quality and knowledge. If anything, future cataloging will be more difficult due to the proliferation of genres, formats, and representation. If my vision doesn't happen, cataloging departments won't gather strength and scholarship will be diluted. That possibility worries me much more than the possibility that vendors might take over and become the locus for future training.

Q. What salaries are vendors paying music catalogers? What are the qualifications required by vendors?

A. My experience with anything OCLC-related is that they are tough about qualifications. People want to work for OCLC, and I suspect it's because they pay well. Over the last couple of years the salary for beginning catalogers has ranged from about $24,000 to $40,000. Vendors have always been on the high end of that scale. The hard thing for entry level catalogers, especially those with training in academic settings, is going from the atmosphere of academia into what they perceive to be a very high-pressured situation. Vendors, notably OCLC, do better training, at least in my experience with MOUG and OLAC. Training and standards will be high because the "dirtier" the database, the more unhappy customers are and the more work and unrest it makes for vendors. Doing a good job pays off for them in good will and future customers.

Q. What are you telling students just starting in library school who say they want to be catalogers? I've heard stories of people discouraging that.

A. I tell students to get as much expertise in cataloging as they can, and then as much experience as possible in management. They will have to know cataloging even if they don't do it. In a scholarly institution they will always have to catalog some percentage of materials because the institution will be the only place that has some items. Some portion of students will end up cataloging, but it is highly unlikely they will do cataloging exclusively unless they work for a vendor or Harvard! Cataloging has become more challenging with non-book formats; so too is vendor cataloging becoming more challenging. Libraries are now outsourcing the interesting formats. I also tell students it is not unlikely their job will be for a vendor as opposed to a college or university.

Q. One problem we've had with a particular vendor is that after we talked with them for about eight months, they had a complete turnover in staff. There was no one left who was in the original group. To what extent do you see vendors providing a stable atmosphere for catalogers to work long
enough to be able to gain the experience that creates cataloging expertise?

A. That is a difficult question. True, there has not been a lot of recent turnover in the academic community. Now we're a graying profession; it will not be so stable in the future. Students take their first cataloging job and move out of it after the first year or two. Things are stable on top, but not underneath. Vendors are still growing, changing, and establishing a persona. Until they reach an optimal size there will be turnover. There will be a certain amount of instability over the next five to eight years, with institutions and with vendors. It will probably be another eight to ten years before we reach an equilibrium.

Q. You've mentioned that reference service is an important experience for catalogers to have. Do you see a way for catalogers working for vendors to have that same sort of experience?

A. I think it is unlikely. One of the drawbacks to working for vendors is you might only be able to do cataloging. Using all aspects of one's training and skills is what is exciting for me. Catalogers working for vendors will undoubtedly miss interaction with researchers. For people who like to catalog forty hours a week, the vendor may be the answer. The person who wants to interact with patrons can do some reference work as a consultant outside of business hours. Catalogers working for vendors can work with other staff if they do training, and they can branch out to customer services as well. One could also become a "music information entrepreneur," although that is risky and requires commercial drive.

Q. Is the trend toward cooperative cataloging threatened if we outsource to vendors?

A. I don't think it is a problem—vendors are happy to participate. In fact, most will play an active role. Catalogers will have to relinquish some control, but vendors won't dilute or destroy cooperation. However, they may take it over. For example, CONSER was taken over by OCLC after it was dropped by LC. Our lobbying efforts are so important. We need to let vendors do what they do best and not let them do what they don't do best. We're a very powerful force. We need to set the goals and agenda for music scholarship. Our agenda should be to promote scholarship for if that lags, so too will resource needs.

---

The Best of MOUG is Still Available

The Best of MOUG is a list of uniform titles for prolific composers and a list of cross references for Slavic uniform titles. It is an excellent tool for catalogers and public service librarians that can be kept at a desk, card catalog or online terminal for quick, easy access to uniform titles for the composers that are the most difficult to search online. The cost is $15.00 (North America) $20.00 (Overseas) per copy. All orders must be prepaid. Make checks payable to Music OCLC Users Group (Tax. No.: 31-095197). Mail to: Judy Weidow, Cataloging S5453, General Libraries, The University of Texas at Austin, PO Box P, Austin, TX 78713-8916

CHANGE OF DATE FOR THE 1999 ANNUAL MOUG MEETING

The date of the 1999 annual MOUG Meeting, to be held in conjunction with the annual Music Library Association Meeting in Los Angeles, has been changed.

| Original date for MOUG: | March 2-3, 1999 |
| NEW date: | March 16-17, 1999 |

| Original date for MLA: | March 3-6, 1999 |
| NEW date: | March 17-20, 1999 |
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP

Balance in Checking Account on January 1, 1997 $11,915.73
Balance in Saving Account on January 1, 1997 14,444.31
Total Cash Available on January 1, 1997 26,360.04

INCOME

Memberships          $ 5,245.00
Meeting Registrations 4,040.00
   New Orleans 2,110.00
   Series workshop 870.00
   Boston 1,060.00
Publications:
   Best of MOUG 6th ed. 4,415.00
   NACO Music Handbook 87.50
Bank Interest 312.85
Total Income 14,100.35

EXPENSES

Annual Meeting (New Orleans)
  Food (Recp, breaks) 1,908.09
  Speakers/Honoraria 100.00
  Meal for speakers 67.00
  Copying/Supplies 151.54
  Shipping 22.44
  Miscellaneous 150.00
  Series workshop 339.51
New Orleans Board meeting 1,903.35
Fall Board meeting 1,813.49
  Travel 828.82
  Lodging 887.64
  Meal 97.03
Publications:
  Newsletters 3,714.89
    Printing 3,092.41
    Postage 601.18
    Supplies 21.30
  Best of MOUG 6th ed.
    Printing 2,282.40
    Postage 532.95
    Refund 35.00
    Supplies 134.39
NACO Music Handbook 119.42
  Printing 81.10
  Postage 30.40
  Supplies 7.92
MOUG flyer 35.70
NACO Music:
  ALA/NACO (1/97) 494.25
  NMP:PCC (7/97) 906.25
  NMP:PCC (Fall, 1997) 466.72
OCULC Users Council Reporter 704.18
Office Expenses:
  Postage 307.60
  Supplies 185.96
  Webpage domain registration 100.00
Miscellaneous 62

TOTAL EXPENSES 16,475.75

Net loss - 2,375.40

Balance in Checking Account on December 31, 1997 11,266.37
Balance in Saving Account on December 31, 1997 12,718.27
Total Cash Available on December 31, 1997 23,984.66
Music OCLC Users Group
Bylaws

ARTICLE I. NAME

The name of this organization shall be the MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP, hereafter referred to as the Group.

ARTICLE II. OBJECTIVES

SECTION 1. To establish and maintain the representation of a large and specific group of individuals and institutions having a professional interest in, and whose needs encompass, all OCLC systems and subsystems and their impact on music libraries, music materials, and music users.

SECTION 2. To encourage and facilitate the exchange of information:
   a) between OCLC and the members of the Group;
   b) between OCLC and the profession of music librarianship in general;
   c) between members of the Group and appropriate representatives of the Library of Congress; and
   d) between members of the Group and similar users' organizations.

SECTION 3. To promote and maintain the highest standards of system usage, and to provide for continuing user education that the membership may achieve those standards.

SECTION 4. To provide a vehicle for communication among and with the members of the Group.

SECTION 5. The Group is a non-stock, non-profit association, organized and operated exclusively for said purposes. No part of the net earnings shall inure to the benefit of any individual. No officer, member, or delegate of a member shall, as such, receive compensation except that reasonable compensation may be paid for services of employees of the Group.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. Membership in the Group shall be open to all individuals and institutions interested in the stated objectives of the Group.

SECTION 2. The annual dues shall be set by the Executive Board, subject to approval by the membership at the annual meeting. The Treasurer shall bill members at the beginning of the penultimate month of the fiscal year, and notify members three months in arrears. Those whose dues are not paid within ninety days thereafter shall be automatically removed from the membership list of the Group. [Second sentence amended 12/97]

SECTION 3. Voting privileges shall be extended to individual members only. [added 12/93]

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The officers of the Group shall be:
   1) a Chair;
   2) a Vice Chair/Chair Elect or Past Chair;
   3) a Secretary/Newsletter Editor;
   4) a Treasurer; and
   5) a Continuing Education Coordinator.
These officers shall constitute the Executive Board.
SECTION 2. Nominating Procedures. The Nominating Committee shall nominate candidate(s) for each office and shall submit its slate to the Executive Board for approval no less than three months before the annual meeting. The Committee shall be comprised as specified in Article VII, Section 2. Candidates for office must be individual members of the Group in good standing at the time the ballot is distributed and must file an acceptance of the nomination with the Committee. [First and third sentences amended 12/97]

SECTION 3. Election Procedures. The slate approved by the Executive Board as per Article IV, Section 2 shall be presented to the membership for election of officers. Officers shall be elected by a plurality of the ballots cast by the voting membership. Ballots shall be distributed no less than two months before the annual meeting and shall be returned by the voting members to the Nominating Committee no later than the date specified on the ballot. A majority of the voting members of the Executive Board shall resolve a tied vote. [First sentence added 12/97; second sentence amended 12/93]

SECTION 4. Terms of office. The term of office of the Chair shall be two years as Chair and one year each as Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Past Chair. An incumbent shall not succeed him/herself. The offices of Secretary/Newsletter Editor, Treasurer, and Continuing Education Coordinator shall be two years. An incumbent in these offices may succeed him/herself. In order to assure a measure of continuity within the Executive Board, a call for the nomination and election of two of the four offices (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Secretary/Newsletter Editor, Treasurer, and Continuing Education Coordinator) shall occur each year, with the remaining two offices to be nominated and elected on the alternate years. In the event of the resignation, incapacitation or removal of any of the officers, the remaining officers shall select a replacement until the next election. The officers shall serve until the adjournment of the final session of the meeting at which the names of their successors are made public.

SECTION 5. Duties of officers. The officers shall perform the duties prescribed by these Bylaws and by the parliamentary authority adopted by the Group.

1) Chair. The Chair shall act as chief executive officer with general supervision and control of the affairs of the Group. The Chair shall also serve as a member ex-officio of all committees except the Nominating Committee, and shall act as ex-officio liaison to OCLC and other appropriate affiliations as indicated. In addition, the Chair, in consultation with the Executive Board, shall appoint individual members of the Group to standing, continuing, or special committees, or to other nonelective positions. [Second and third sentences amended 12/97]

2) Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect or Past Chair. The Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect or Past Chair shall act as chief executive officer in the event of the inability of the chair to serve. The Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect or Past Chair shall also assist with general supervision and control of the affairs of the Group at the discretion of the chair. [Title, first and second sentences amended 12/97]

3) Secretary/Newsletter Editor. The Secretary/Newsletter Editor shall record the minutes of the annual business meeting and the sessions of the Executive Board. In addition, the Secretary/Newsletter Editor, as editor-in-chief of the principal vehicle for communication to the membership, shall assure publication of the Newsletter at appropriate and timely intervals.

4) Treasurer. The Treasurer shall act as Membership Officer, and shall be responsible for all financial accounts of the Group and for maintaining accurate records of income, expenditures, and membership for submission to the Executive Board.

ARTICLE V. EXECUTIVE BOARD

SECTION 1. The Executive Board, comprised of the elected officers, shall:
1) have general supervision of the affairs of the Group;
2) act in the name of the Group between the annual meetings of the Group;
3) fill by appointment any vacancy in office for the unexpired term;
4) provide a report of its activities at the annual meeting;
5) authorize necessary disbursements through checks drawn on the account of the Group and signed by the Treasurer;
6) perform such other duties as are specified in these Bylaws.
ARTICLE VI. OCLC LIAISON

OCLC will be invited to appoint an OCLC staff member as a liaison to the Group. The liaison will be invited to serve as an ex-officio member of the Group's Executive Board and to provide information regarding OCLC products as appropriate. [ Entire article replaced 12/97]

ARTICLE VII. COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. Program Committee. A Program Committee, comprised of no fewer than three members plus the Continuing Education Coordinator, shall be appointed by the Chair immediately following the annual membership meeting. It shall be the purpose of this committee, under the direction of the Continuing Education Coordinator, to prepare in detail the program of activities for the forthcoming annual meeting. Committee members shall be individual members of the Group in good standing. [First sentence amended 12/97; third sentence added, 12/97]

SECTION 2. Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee, comprised of three members, shall be appointed by the Chair no less than six months before the annual meeting. Membership may include one member of the Executive Board, except the Chair. This Committee shall be responsible for assembling a slate of candidates for elective office. Committee members shall be individual members of the Group in good standing. [Third sentence amened; fourth sentence added 12/97]

SECTION 3. Such other committees, standing or special, shall be appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the Executive Board, as the membership or the Executive Board may recommend in fulfillment of the objectives of the Group. Committee members shall be individual members of the Group in good standing. [Fourth sentence added 12/97]

ARTICLE VIII. MEETINGS

SECTION 1. Annual Meeting. An annual membership meeting of the Group shall be held at a time and location to be determined by the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. Business Meeting. A business meeting shall be held during each annual meeting of the Group. The membership in attendance at the business meeting shall constitute a quorum.

SECTION 3. Special Meetings. The Chair may call a special meeting at the request of either the Executive Board or five members of the Group. The purpose of the meeting shall be stated in the call. At such a meeting, no business may be transacted other than that stated in the notification.

ARTICLE IX. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Group in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not found to be inconsistent with these Bylaws and any special rules of order the Group may adopt.

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

These Bylaws may be amended in a mail ballot by a two-thirds vote of ballots cast by the voting membership. Proposed amendments should be submitted in writing and signed by five members. [first sentence amended 12/93]

ARTICLE XI. DISSOLUTION.

Should future exigencies make the dissolution of the Group necessary, the properties of the Group shall be disposed of as deemed fitting by the majority of the membership.

1988 Bylaws Revision Committee: Don Hixon, Chair, David Knapp, Dawn Thistle
Amended by vote of the membership, 12/93; 12/97
IN THE NEXT ISSUE:

MOUG Time Line by Jay Weiss and Neil Hughes
More MOUG Annual Meeting Reports
Breakout sessions:
- A Comparison of FirstSearch WorldCat Functionality With MLA's Automation Requirements for Music Information
- It’s Not Just for Catalogers: Searching WorldCat, the OCLC Online Union Catalog for Acquisitions, Collection Development and Reference
- Correct AACR2r transcription of contents in bibliographic records for music materials: a joint MOUG/BCC Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging
- Music Cooperative Cataloging in WorldCat: An Historical View
Report of the NACO-MUSIC Project Participants' Meeting
Report of the LITA/ALCTS Authority Control in the Online Environment Interest Group

THE MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
PROUDLY ANNOUNCES THE PUBLICATION OF
Cataloging Musical Moving Image Material
Edited by Lowell Ashley
$28.00. ($22.40 to MLA Members)

Cataloging Musical Moving Image Material is a guide for catalogers in all types of libraries who work with videos and films of musical performances and presentations. The guide also addresses the cataloging of videos and films of multifaceted performances and presentations where music is an important component of the production (such as ballet performances) as well as videos and films of musical performances seen itself. Both descriptive cataloging, based on AACR2r and LCRs, and subject cataloging, based primarily on LCSH, are treated in detail.

While controversial questions involving descriptive cataloging are acknowledged and possible inadequacies in current cataloging rules are presented, the guide attempts to adhere to current standards and takes a position on the possible resolution of some issues currently in dispute.

Forty-two examples of bibliographic records appear in MARC format. Every example includes an LC classification number, LC subject headings, and genre terms from Moving Image Materials Genre Terms.

The guide was a project of the Music Library Association's Working Group on Bibliographic Control of Music Video Material, consisting of five experienced music and audiovisual materials catalogers, with input from numerous individuals and organizations interested in the cataloging of moving image media and music. The Working Group was appointed by the Music Library Association to report to the MLA Bibliographic Control Committee.

Editor Lowell Ashley, who chaired the Working Group, is Principal Cataloger at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He has cataloged music, sound recordings, and audiovisual materials for many years and has served on the Cataloging Policy Committee of Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc.

This report is available from The Music Library Association, Inc., PO. Box 487, Canton, MA 02021, or from library bookdealers.
MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
Application for New Members

Personal Membership is $10.00; institutional membership is $15.00; international membership (outside North America) is $25.00. Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members receive all newsletters for the year, and any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed upon receipt of dues payment). Personal members, please include home address. Institutional members, please note **four lines, 24 characters per line limit.** We encourage institutional members to subscribe via their vendor (Faxon, etc.)

NAME: ____________________________________________

ADDRESS: __________________________________________

HOME PHONE: ( ) __________________ WORK PHONE: ( ) __________________

FAX NUMBER: ( ) __________________

INSTITUTION NAME: __________________________________________

POSITION TITLE: __________________________________________

INSTITUTION ADDRESS: __________________________________________

E-MAIL ADDRESS(ES): __________________________________________

Check for membership dues, payable to MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP must accompany this application:

____ $10.00 Personal (North America)

____ $15.00 Institutional (North American)

____ $25.00 Personal and Institutional (outside North America)

Please complete this form, enclose check, and mail to: Jane Edmister Penner, Treasurer, Music OCLC Users Group, University of Virginia, Music Library, Old Cabell Hall, Charlottesville, VA 22903

Michelle Koth
MOUG Secretary/Newsletter Editor
Music Library
Yale University
PO Box 208320
New Haven, CT 06520-8320